OP

THE PATRIARCH AND THE TSAR
Volume 3

William Palmer

UNIVERSITY MICROFILMS
A Xerox Company
Ann Arbor, Michigan, U.S.A.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

https://archive.org/details/patriarchtsar0003will

* * *

This is an authorized facsimile of the original book, and was produced in 1968 by microfilm-xerography by University Microfilms, A Xerox Company, Ann Arbor, Michigan, U.S.A.

* * *

THE PATRIARCH AND THE TSAR.

VOL. III.

HISTORY OF THE

CONDEMNATION OF THE PATRIARCH NICON

BY A PLENARY COUNCIL OF THE ORTHODOX CATHOLIC EASTERN CHURCH,

HELD AT MOSCOW A.D. 1666–1667:

WRITTEN BY PAISIUS LIGARIDES OF SCIO,

EX-ALUMNUS OF THE GREEK COLLEGE AT ROME, AND EX-METROPOLITAN OF GAZA IN THE ORTHODOX EASTERN CHURCH,

WHO CONDUCTED THE PROCEEDINGS AGAINST NICON, AND DEDICATED THIS HISTORY OF THEM TO HIS PATRON THE TSAR ALEXIS MICHAELOVICH.

Translated, with Supplements,

By WILLIAM PALMER, M.A.

LATE FELLOW OF MAGDALEN COLLEGE, OXFORD.

LIBRARY OF
UNITED THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
281.947
N695 P17 72,982

LONDON:

TRÜBNER AND CO., 8 & 60 PATERNOSTER ROW;

OXFORD, PARKER & CO.; CAMBRIDGE, MACMILLAN; ST. PETERSBURG, A. MÜNX; BERLIN, SCHNEIDER & CO., UNTER DEN LINDEN.

1873.

vol 3
1904

UG 12 1968

UNITED THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

BX597
.N5P3

MENTITA EST INIQUITAS SIBI.

37[illegible]
29

LONDON:
ROBSON AND SONS, PRINTERS, PANCRAS ROAD, N.W.

THE PATRIARCH AGAINST THE TSAR,

THE CHURCH AGAINST THE WORLD;

SMYRNA AND PHILADELPHIA AGAINST PERGAMUS AND SARDIS,

PATIENCE AND CHARITY AGAINST VIOLENCE AND CUPIDITY;

THE RESURRECTION (VOSKRESENSK)

AND THE NEW JERUSALEM (NOVI IERUSALIM)

AGAINST BABYLON AND ANTICHRIST.

CONTENTS.

Notices of Paisius Ligarides before his coming to Russia; from a Dissertation published at Moscow in 1662, p. 1. Of the same after his coming to Russia; from the *Hist. Dict. of Eccl. Writers &c.* by Eugenius, sometime metropolitan of Kieff, p. 10. Of the same; from the work of P. Rodota, *Dell' Origine, Progresso e Stato presente del Rito Greco in Italia &c.* Rome, 1763, p. 12.

Paisius' History of the Synod held at Moscow 1666-1667.

Dedication to the tsar Alexis Michaelovich, p. 15. Frontispiece, or physiognomical portraiture of Nicon, p. 21.

Book I. *The Abdication of Nicon.*

Chap. I. Introduction, p. 28.

Chap. II. 'Exposition concerning the following narrative:' Of the erection of the patriarchate of Moscow, p. 29.

Chap. III. 'Embassy sent by the tsar' Theodore Ivan. to Constantinople (in 1592-1593) for the definitive and canonical erection of the same patriarchate, p. 30.

Chap. IV. Of the privileges of the different patriarchates, p. 32.

In connection with the above: Supplements I. and II. p. 313.

Chap. V. Entrance upon the subject.' Nicon, before becoming patriarch in 1652, had dissembled his true character, p. 38.

Chap. VI. 'Statement of the scandal which arose:' How Bogdan Matv. Khitroff made 'a beginning of skirmishing,' p. 39.

Chap. VII. Nicon's abdication (10 July 1658), p. 41.

Chap. VIII. 'A local synod' convened by the tsar (A.D. 1660), p. 43.

Chap. IX. 'Contumacy of Nicon towards the synod,' which he calls a 'synagogue,' p. 46.

Chap. X. 'Doubt of the synod,' whether Nicon's abdication involved also the loss of all sacerdotal rank, p. 48.

Chap. XI. Condescension of the emperor, p. 49.

Chap. XII. 'Arrival at Moscow of the metr. of Gaza' (28 Apr. 1662): he comes of himself (ἰδιοθέλως), without any invitation or mission: Arsenius Souchanoff visits him on behalf of Nicon; and Nicon afterwards writes to him a letter, p. 50.

Letter from Nicon to Ligarides, inserted by the translator, p. 51.

Chap. XIII. 'Answer of Paisius to the letter of Nicon' (an answer written not without the imperial command), 12 July 1662, p. 57.

Chap. XIV. Nicon's idea of appealing to the Pope, p. 69.

Chap. XV. 'Solution of the difficulty of the synod:' Ligarides is called to the patriarchate; and is consulted, 1. about Nicon's feigned appeal to the Pope; 2. whether the faith of the Russians came from Byzantium? and at what time? p. 72.

Chap. XVI. 'Questions of the Boyars:' especially of XXX. Questions addressed to him in writing by the boyar Simeon Lucian. Streshneff, maternal uncle to the tsar, and his Answers to the same (against these Nicon wrote his Replies or Objections); Paisius Ligarides (one day in Lent, 1663) is introduced privately to the council-chamber at the palace, and is consulted first by the boyars, and then by the emperor himself. He advises the emperor to write *secretly* of the demands or presumptions of Nicon to the four œcumenical patriarchs, saying: 'So you will at once obtain your object,' p. 73.

Supplement III. (referring to the XXX. Questions of Streshneff and the Answers of Ligarides, as prefixed separately in Vol. I. to the *Replies* of Nicon, p. xxvii.-xxxix., and as spread together with the replies through the whole of that work), p. 313.

Supplement IV. (in illustration of Paisius' advice), Letter written by P. Ligarides to the tsar on Whitsunday, 7 June 1663, p. 313.

Chap. XVII. 'Resolution of the emperor:' Letters are written with XXV. leading Questions *in Greek*, and sent to C.P. by the Greek deacon Meletius, a friend of Ligarides recommended by him for this service. Meletius is also to inform the patriarchs orally respecting Nicon, who is not *named* in the Questions, and to suggest how the Answers should be worded. He leaves Moscow 1 Sept. 1663, p. 75.

Supplement V. The XXV. Questions sent to C.P. with the Answers subscribed by the four patriarchs, which were received at Moscow on Whitsunday, 29 May 1664, p. 317.

Chap. XVIII. 'Another villanous machination of Nicon,' who in the mean time had publicly cursed the emperor: a commission, with Ligarides as chief representative of the clergy, and the prince Niketa Iv. Odoefsky as chief representative of the synclete, is sent to Voskresensk 17 July 1663, p. 76.

Chap. XIX. 'Departure of the imperial commissioners:' Nicon refuses to receive P. Ligarides unless he brings canonical letters: he goes however to him with the rest; and exhibits no letters: but, according to his own account, he whispers in the ear of the patriarch, in Romaic, an unmentionable word, p. 77.

Supplement VI. (referring for Nicon's account of this commission to p. 586-604 of his *Replies* &c.), p. 349.

Chap. XX. 'Return of Meletius,' with the Answers subscribed by the four œcumenical patriarchs, Whitsunday, 29 May 1664: Athanasius of Andros metropolitan of Iconium denounces these Answers and the patriarchal subscriptions as forgeries: he is confuted, p. 83.

Supplement VII. Separate letter to the tsar from the patriarch of Jerusalem Nectarius, dated 20 March 1664, not trusted to Meletius, but sent separately by Sebastus and others who were going *for alms* to Moscow, p. 349.

Chap. XXI. 'Second mission to the œcumenical patriarchs' of Meletius and Stephen, another Greek a native of Andros, to obtain assurance of the genuineness of the Tomes, and to induce the patriarchs to come in person to Moscow, p. 84.

Supplement VIII. 1 and 6. Two extracts from Solovieff's *History of Russia* &c., giving notices (but confused and dislocated) of the tsar's missions to the Levant in 1664-1666; also, 2, 4, 3, and 5, two letters from Athanasius metr. of Iconium to Nicon, and Nicon's Answers, p. 356-370.

Supplement IX. Extract from Solovieff's *History of Russia:* Nicon writes to the tsar on hearing of his having sent to the Eastern patriarchs, p. 370.

Chap. XXII. 'Furtive attempt of Nicon:' that is, his unexpected return to Moscow in the night, 17-18 Dec. 1664, p. 85.

Supplement VIII. 6. Letter, dated 12 Nov. 1664, and referred to repeatedly by P. Ligarides as appointing him to be exarch or representative of the patriarch Dionysius of C.P. and of all the synod, to explain and defend the patriarchal Tomes, and to conduct the case respecting Nicon to a final decision (see p. 89, 92, 235, where he appeals to it as to a genuine document even in 1667, and shows that he is ignorant what inquiries had been made about it, and with what result).

The second mission of Meletius and Stephen in the autumn of 1664 is first alluded to only by Solovieff (see p. 360), through an answer made about it to the envoy Sabbas at Thessalonica in 1666 by Kyr Dionysius, then expatriarch. In the notes at the end of his vol. xi. he gives part of 'a Letter of the patriarch Dionysius' to the tsar, mentioning 'faculties' sent to 'Kyr Paisius, the *holy* and intelligent metropolitan of Gaza,' &c. as above; and dated 12 Nov. 1664 (see Suppl. VIII. p. 370). Solovieff gives this letter *without any hint of forgery*, though he has printed in his history something of what was answered by the expatriarch Dionysius in 1666, about the character of Ligarides and his agents Meletius and Stephen, and especially this, that he had never *received* Stephen at C.P. nor given him any letters, though the Chartophylax *had tried to induce* him to give such a letter in favour of Ligarides (see p. 360). Solovieff, however, disconnects Stephen from the letter of 12 Nov. 1664, as if it was not till Jan. 1665 that he parted from Meletius in Moldavia to go to Constantinople (p. 361). On the other hand, he represents the separate letter of the patriarch Nectarius to the tsar, really dated 20 March 1664, as if it were written after his conferences with Meletius in Jan. 1665: and in the midst of extracts from this letter of 1664, so presented, he interposes the information that Nectarius 'having been told that Paisius Ligarides was styling himself patriarchal exarch, replied to *the envoy* that *nobody* had been invested with the quality of exarch' (see p. 363). This 'envoy,' thus disconnected both from name and date, and smothered between passages from Nectarius's letter of 1654, was certainly not Mele-

tius in Jan. 1655, but may have been possibly the envoy Sabbas, who, we know, was sent in 1666 to make inquiries about the character of Ligarides and his friends and agents Meletius and Stephen, and about the letter or letters brought by Stephen from Constantinople, p. 363.

Supplement X. Letters written by P. Ligarides in Greek for the tsar, in the tsar's name, to Kyr Dionysius patriarch of C.P. and to Kyr Nectarius patriarch of Jerusalem, in Jan. 1665; complaining to them both of Nicon's *uncanonical* return to Moscow, and replying *sarcastically* to that separate letter which Nectarius had written in March 1664 to the tsar, p. 372-379.

Chap. XXIII. 'Return of them that had been sent on the second mission:' and, first, of the envoy Stephen: he had had (so he *said*) a *private interview* at C.P. with the patriarch Dionysius, and had *delivered to him* the tsar's letters, to which *the patriarch wrote* a suitable answer, appointing moreover the metr. of Gaza to be the interpreter of the patriarchal Tomes, and the most confidential mouthpiece of all the synod; as is contained in the patriarchal letter of instructions to him (the 'faculties') which is laid up in the imperial archives (see Suppl. VIII. 6, p. 369, 370): Athanasius metr. of Iconium is again confuted, and confined in the Simonoff till his untimely death, p. 89.

Chap. XXIV. Embassy from the emperor to the sultan, p. 90.

Chap. XXV. 'Another secret mission to the expatriarch of C.P. Dionysius,' now (that is, in Jan. 1666) metr. of Thessalonica, where he was seen by this envoy Sabbas, kellar of the Choudoff. Sabbas went also to C.P.; but the patriarch there, Parthenius iv. Koumkoum (Μογλαλος), fearing the grand vizir, would have nothing to say to him, p. 91.

Supplement XI. Letter of Nicon, written in Dec. 1665, to the patriarch of C.P. Dionysius, intercepted on the way in Little Russia, in Jan. 1666 (when Dionysius had ceased to be the sitting patriarch), p. 379.

Chap. XXVI. 'Pecuniary loss of the metr. of Gaza:' his deacon Agathangelus, having gone to Voskresensk to Nicon, utters many calumnies against him, p. 92.

Chap. XXVII. 'Another commission sent from the emperor to Nicon' (in consequence of a petition from the bishops), to desire of him a written judgment concerning the confession and communion of condemned felons: Nicon sends also information of all the 'calumnies' he had been hearing against the metr. of Gaza, p. 94.

Chap. XXVIII. 'Manifold calumnies brought against the metr. of Gaza:' The emperor is *utterly shocked;* and shows him, in presence of *certain special individuals of the boyars, Nicon's letter.*[1] Paisius, if convicted on one point, pleads guilty to all, but claims, if he can clear himself on any one point, to be acquitted on all, p. 99.

[1] Nicon in his Letter also to the patriarch Dionysius, after speaking of the way in which Paisius Ligarides had been received without canonical letters, and had even been made president among the clergy, wrote that he was under the imputation of an unmentionable crime. But the *first allusion* to such sin here comes from Ligarides himself, he having (according to his own statement) whispered a certain word in Romaic, as early as July 1663, into the ear of Nicon; in order that Nicon may now seem to be retaliating, out of revenge for that insinuation.

Chap. XXIX. 'Decision and investigation by the synod.' Two points are examined: 1. whether Paisius is orthodox? and 2. whether he practises astrology? He is fully acquitted on both: Agathangelus is brought in in irons, and is imprisoned till he declares publicly that all that had been said and written against the metr. of Gaza was *false*, p. 100.

Chap. XXX. 'Ordination of new bishops,' in 1664, and translation of others, by order of the tsar, with the blessing of the metr. of Gaza: And the tsar thus continued to use him, though he knew now what imputations he lay under, without applying first, at least, to the patriarch of Jerusalem, to learn more about his true character and status, p. 101.

Chap. XXXI. 'Synodical review of Nicon's acts' (in the spring of 1666): and of his having carried off the staff of St. Peter the first metr. of Moscow: those who through surprise had acknowledged him as patriarch on the 18th Dec. 1664 are now pardoned, p. 102.

Chap. XXXII. 'Of certain heterodox Schismatics:' Ligarides, by order of the tsar and the synod, composes against them a book, the *Staff of Rule* &c., which is translated afterwards from his Latin into Russ by Simeon of Pololsk, and finally printed, p. 106.

Chap. XXXIII. Zeal of Paul, now metr. of Krontitz, Paisius of Gaza, and Hilarion of Riazan against the Russian innovators, p. 108.

Supplement XII. (in connection with p. 106-110 and 197-199, respecting the new Schismatics, and referring to Appendix III. to *Travels of Macarius*), p. 400.

Chap. XXXIV. 'Announcement of the approach of the patriarchs,' that is, of Paisius of Alexandria and Macarius of Antioch, p. 110.

Chap. XXXV. Salutation of the two patriarchs by grandees sent in the emperor's name, p. 113.

Chap. XXXVI. 'Arrival of the two most blessed patriarchs:' Letter of welcome from the emperor (13 Oct. 1666), p. 116.

'Epilogue:' Nicon alone is troubled and annoyed, p. 117.

Book II. *Deposition and Degradation of Nicon.*

'Introduction:' Of the Threes, p. 118.

Chap. I. 'Arrival of the patriarchs, and how they were first met with an address of welcome' by Hilarion abp. of Riazan, p. 119.

Chap. II. 'Entry of the patriarchs into Moscow:' address by Paul metr. of Krontitz, p. 120.

Chap. III. 'Audience of the patriarchs:' their speech to the emperor, and his speech in reply, p. 123.

Chap. IV. Homage of the bishops: gifts from the archimandrites: address from the metr. of Gaza, p. 126.

Chap. V. Other addresses to the two patriarchs, p. 128.

Chap. VI. 'Visits of the patriarchs to two holy monasteries:' Latin address from Simeon of Pololsk (translated into Greek by the metr. of Gaza), p. 130.

Supplement XIV. Other letters and addresses welcoming the patriarchs on their approach, and on their arrival at Moscow, not given by Paisius Ligarides, p. 402.

RN's, LPN's, CNA's
BATTLE CREEK, MI • 616-968-50

VII. Certain preparatory matters or synodical questions: Whe-
ls are lawful, and useful, p. 131.

VIII. 'Whether it was competent for our autocrat Alexis to
synod?' or should synods be convoked only by patriarchal au-
or by the Bishop of Rome? p. 135.

IX. What, then, is this present assembly? an *œcumenical synod*,
ular trial and judgment? p. 140.

X. 'How two great questions were proposed to the patriarchs
on:' viz. 1. Why is the patriarch of Alexandria styled œcu-
udge? and 2. When was the patriarch of Antioch first styled
fathers, *i.e.* Πατριάρχης? p. 144.

XI. 'Synodical meeting (7 and 28 Nov.) in the *Zolotaia palata*
en hall) of the palace:' speech of the emperor: The patriarchal
Tomes (translated about this time into Russ by the metr. of Gaza) are
read; and declared to apply to Nicon: Libels of the chief charges against
him are given to the patriarchs, to study in their cells; and two Russian
bishops, Paul metr. of Kroutitz and Hilarion abp. of Riazan, are to
explain them orally: but the patriarchs of themselves ask the tsar to
give them also Paisius Ligarides, which he does, saying: 'From him you
can learn *all*, with as much detail as you please,' p. 155.

Chap. XII. 'Summary of the libels of accusation presented to the two
patriarchs against Nicon:' digested by Paisius Ligarides, p. 157.

Supplement XIII. (in connection with passages at p. 159 and p. 79.)
Of the red-striped mandya, for wearing which Nicon is blamed: and of
the pastoral staff given to him by the patriarch of Antioch in 1655, and
wrested out of his hands by the same patriarch, or rather by the four
patriarchs and the tsar, in 1666, p. 400.

Chap. XIII. 'How Nicon was summoned by the synod, and came and
appeared before it:' having first been anointed, and having confessed,
and celebrated the liturgy, commemorating in it only the patriarch of
Constantinople *Parthenius*, p. 166.

Supplement XV. Minutes and reports concerning the same; from the
archives of the patriarchate at Moscow, p. 412.

Chap. XIV. 'How Nicon appeared personally before the most sacred
synod,' and before the tsar and the synclete (1 Dec. 1666) in the *Zolotaia
palata* of the palace: his abdication is urged against him, and his inter-
cepted Letter to the patriarch Dionysius; and, especially, his having charged
the tsar and the synclete with latinising, because they took a blessing
for the government of the Church from Paisius Ligarides, p. 168.

Chap. XV. 'How Nicon was synodically condemned in the second act:'
(two sessions of 'Wednesday' the 3d Dec. and Friday the 5th being
here consolidated). They read out in the synod the following words:
'*Witnesses* must be credible persons, not in want of money, not of bad
repute, not in the pay of others, not heretics, nor personal enemies.'
It was urged against Nicon that he had degraded Paul bishop of Ko-
lomna, of himself alone, without a synod: The heads of the patriarchal
Tomes sent in 1661 are read out, especially chap. xiv. adducing can. ii.
of the council held in St. Sophia (misquoted as xiii. of the council called

the First and Second, held in the church of the Holy Apostles) : Nicon answers *contumaciously :* he objects too to the two patriarchs that they have lost their chairs at Cairo and Damascus by absenting themselves without the sultan's permission, and that others now hold them (comp. p 184 and 189). The patriarchs take from Nicon the cross. The bishops are asked, first the Greek, and then the Russian, how he is to be punished ? and they all reply that he is to be degraded in the most complete manner. The patriarch of Antioch says that he has shown himself even *worse than Satan ;* and the patriarch of Alexandria, as œcumenical judge, delivers the judgment. Order is given that this sentence be written out in Greek and in Russ, p. 178.

Chap. XVI. 'How Nicon was definitively deposed by sentence of the synod in its third act,' 12th Dec. ; this meeting being held in the patriarchate without the tsar, and the act itself being performed in a chapel over the back gates of the Choudoff monastery, p. 191.

Supplement XVI. Account of the four sessions and acts of Dec. 1, 3, 5, and 12, from the papers of the prikaz of secret service, so far as they have been used by M. Solovieff in vol. xi. of his *History of Russia*, p. 416.

Supplement XVII. Official account of the same, as preserved in the archives of the patriarchate at Moscow, headed 'Act xiv. Of the deposition from the chair of the *late* patriarch Nicon,' p. 437.

Chap. XVII. 'Recapitulation of the troubles which had come upon the Church' by the fault of Nicon : The tsar commits to the two patriarchs the task of making a general correction and settlement, p. 197.

Supplement XVIII. Other documents respecting the degradation and imprisonment of Nicon ; from the archives of the patriarchate at Moscow, p. 450.

Supplement XIX. Communications addressed in Dec. 1666 by the two patriarchs Paisius of Alexandria and Macarius of Antioch to their brethren the patriarch Nectarius of Jerusalem (p. 456) and the patriarch Parthenius of Constantinople, p. 456, 459.

BOOK III. *Creation of a new Patriarch, Joasaph II.*

Introduction : Preliminaries to the election &c. of the new patriarch Kyr Joasaph : Of the Threes, p. 199.

Chap. I. 'How the two patriarchs celebrated the liturgy in the great church,' *i.e.* on the 21st Dec., the festival of St. Peter the first metropolitan of Moscow, p. 199.

Chap. II. 'How on the fest. of Christ's Nativity the patriarchs came to the palace to sing the polychronion for the emperor ;' the hours and the vespers having been sung according to custom on the eve in *the patriarchal palace :* The patriarchs also afterwards celebrated the liturgy before the emperor in the cathedral, p. 200.

Chap. III. How the two patriarchs came also on the new year (Jan. 1. 1667) to the palace, and celebrated there the liturgy, p. 202.

Chap. IV. How the chronological reckoning of the years of the world from the creation was made a question by the Russian bishops, p. 204.

Supplement XX. Of the era of the creation, placed by the Egyptians,

the Babylonians, and the Indians, in accord with the Hebrews, about the autumnal equinox in the anticipated Julian year B.C. 5362, p. 463.

Chap. v. How the blessing of the water was performed *twice*, once on the eve, and again on the festival itself of the Lights (the Theophany or Epiphany), p. 207.

Chap. vi. 'How some of the Russian bishops were unwilling to subscribe the deposition of Nicon:' especially Paul the metr. of Kroutitz and Hilarion archbishop of Riazan, 'who seemed to be pillars,' and who had been foremost to act against the person of Nicon, yet did not wish to subject the clergy unreservedly to the boyars: they demurred to the doctrine of the patriarchal tomes (as dishonestly translated by Ligarides), that there was only one principle of government, viz. the tsar. Paisius now discusses the three unctions of prophet, priest, and king, p. 207.

Chap. vii. Whether the high-priesthood and the empire are ever united in one and the same person, p. 210.

Chap. viii. Whether this unction which is given is to be understood materially or intellectually, p. 212.

Chap. ix. Of the meeting of the bishops to consider the question previously proposed, whether the patriarch be subject to the emperor? p. 213.

Chap. x. How the bishops met, and the passages relating to the imperial and royal power were read, p. 222.

Chap. xi. 'Of a memorial or petition presented secretly to the patriarchs by the two bishops.' The metr. of Gaza exclaims: 'I myself will answer this *most foolish and wicked* libel, inasmuch as the œcumenical patriarch Dionysius appointed me to be the guardian, interpreter, and the champion of the patriarchal tomes; and I have by no means been paid to hold my tongue.' 'Ye fear,' he says, 'for the *future*; lest some future sovereign *enslave the Russian Church*. There is *no chance* of this. This will *never* be! From a *good* emperor [Alexis] that son who shall succeed him [Peter the Great] will be *still better*,' p. 230.

Chap. xii. 'Decision of the synod respecting the question mentioned above as laid before it.' Of anathematising rebels: Of the emperor entering the sanctuary: The king or emperor has the preëminence in *political* matters, and the patriarch in *ecclesiastical*, p. 241.

Chap. xiii. 'How the two bishops were summoned before the synod and suspended;' though they had in the mean time repented, and had both of them subscribed separately the patriarchal tomes, *with every jot and tittle* of their contents (and so had swallowed the exaggerations of Paisius' version uncorrected), p. 251.

Chap. xiv. 'How all met in the *stauropegion* (the Choudoff monastery) to elect a new patriarch.' Three questions: 1. Can a bishop lawfully take a third see? 2. Can there be a reordination of one who is already a bishop? and 3. Is it lawful that the patriarch should be chosen by lot? p. 257.

Chap. xv. Resolution of these three preliminary questions, p. 262.

Chap. xvi. 'How Kyr Joasaph was proclaimed patriarch of Moscow,' his advanced age being a convenience (see p. 261) and a recommendation:

This nomination was in the council-chamber: The three names presented to the emperor (none of them names of bishops) were read out by Almiaz Ivanoff: and the emperor preferred that which stood first of the three. News on the 1st of Feb. of the conclusion of a truce with Poland, p. 266.

Chap. XVII. 'How the two suspended bishops were called before the synod, and made their apology;' and were pardoned: and how beneficial it was to the rest to see their contentiousness thus come to nothing, and end *in sardonic laughter:* To complete their forgiveness they were admitted also (after being reproached by him before all, with words which went deep, for their schism) to kiss the hand of the emperor; having repeated over and over again '*Peccavimus.*' There was still some whispering, however, even after this, about the absolute supremacy of the emperor; and about the anathematising of rebels; and against a patriarchal *oath* of allegiance, p. 273.

Chap. XVIII. 'How Kyr Joasaph, the new patriarch, was ordained' on the Sunday of the Carnival, 10th Feb. (*Paisius Ligarides also joining in the imposition of hands*), p. 279.

Supplement XXI. Letter given to the new patriarch of Moscow Joasaph after his consecration. Also two orders for changing the archimandrite who was in charge of the monk Nicon (from the archives of the patriarchate), p. 468.

Supplement XXII. (with reference to what is alluded to at p. 189, 184, 185, 130-131.) Letter from the tsar to the patriarch of C.P. Parthenius, written seemingly in the spring of 1667, to engage him to obtain the restoration of the patriarchs Paisius of Alexandria and Macarius of Antioch to their sees, which, in consequence of their having absented themselves *without the permission of the civil rulers*, had been filled up *as vacant*, and were now held by others. The tsar wrote also, in 1667, a letter to the same patriarch of C.P., Parthenius, to engage him to obtain the restoration of Paisius Ligarides to the see of Gaza: and he wrote later, in 1669, to the patriarch of Jerusalem Nectarius to ask for *absolution* for the same Paisius Ligarides, continuing to use him in the mean time as if he needed no absolution (see p. 300). Before this last letter was written the tsar had received (in the summer of 1668) a letter from the patriarch Nectarius advising him to keep Ligarides under strict surveillance, lest he should go off to the Pope (see p. 517, 552). The tsar's letter to Nectarius (and one to Methodius, then patriarch of C.P., was sent by the same envoy) was received at C.P. by Dositheus after Nectarius had resigned the patriarchate, in July 1669, p. 470.

Chap. XIX. Solution of certain questions proposed to the three patriarchs, p. 284.

Chap. XX. 'Of certain other questions moved during the great Lent:' especially concerning the validity of Latin baptisms, p. 287.

Supplement XXIII. (referring to the full act of the synod on this subject, as printed in 'Dissertations on Subjects relating to the Orthodox or Eastern-Catholic Communion,' p. 184-198), p. 479.

Chap. XXI. 'Of other occurrences during the great fast:' viz. the erection of some new sees, and the promotion of some sees from a lower

to a higher rank: also of the power of the emperor to create sees, or to raise their rank. Except officiating in sacred things, all the other episcopal privileges are vested in the emperor, p. 295.

Supplement XXIV. Eleven separate acts, tomes, or chapters of the patriarchal synod, which continued to meet at intervals during the first six months of 1667, for the settlement of divers ecclesiastical questions, especially those raised by the raskolniks or starobratsi, who protested against Nicon's correction of the church-books, p. 479.

Chap. XXII. Of the procession on Palm Sunday, and the patriarch's riding on the ass, p. 300.

Chap. XXIII. How the holy Μύρον (the Chrism) was made by the patriarchs: and some other occurrences of the Great Week, p. 303.

Epilogue, p. 310.

Supplement XXV. List of the boyars, okolniks, doumnie dvorianini, and diaki from a little before the time when Paisius Ligarides came to Moscow in 1662 to Easter in 1667: also of other officers of the tsar's court; and of the presidents in the chief prikazes, at the time of Nicon's condemnation in Dec. 1666 (from the *Drevnaia Russkaia Bibliotheca*), p. 518.

Supplement XXVI. Extracts from *The present State of Russia* (A.D. 1660 to 1667; but with some later notices inserted in the second and third editions of 1668 and 1670) by Dr. Samuel Collins, chaplain to the Company of the English Merchants at Moscow, p. 529.

Supplement XXVII. From the archives of the patriarchate at Moscow: An 'Order, made by the œcumenical patriarchs and the synod, for removing the monk Nicon from the Therapontoff to another distant monastery [to the Solovetsky?] on account of certain considerations;' not executed at that time, but put forward by the patriarch Joachim in 1676, May 16, after the death of the tsar Alexis, when Nicon was treated with renewed severity, and was removed from the Therapontoff to the Cyrilloff monastery, p. 538.

Supplement XXVIII. 1. From the archives of the patriarchate: A Minute, how they escorted forth the patriarch Macarius of Antioch with the crosses &c. at his departure from Moscow (31 May 1668); and 2. Letter sent after the patriarch Macarius in July 1668 from the patriarch of Moscow Joasaph; and Answer brought back in October from the same patriarch Macarius, p. 539.

Supplement XXIX. Extracts from P. Theiner's *Monumens Historiques relatifs au règne d'Alexis Michaelovich*, &c. Rome, 1859, p. 52: 1. The Nuncio writes from Warsaw to the Pope, 18 Jan. 1668: 2. The King of Poland writes to the two Eastern Patriarchs then at Moscow, 28 Mar. 1668; 3. and to Paisius Ligarides, same date; 4. and to the Tsar Alexis, same date: 5. the Nuncio from Warsaw, in July 1668, writes to Cardinal Rospigliosi; 6. enclosing a Letter of P. Schieretsky, a Dominican, written at his suggestion to Paisius Ligarides: 7. Reply of Paisius Ligarides to the same P. Schieretsky, 25 Sept. 1668: 8. Communications from the archbishop of Gnesnen to the Nuncio, dated Warsaw, 16 Jan. 1669. Paisius Ligarides speaks of the evil report spread of him by Nectarius patriarch of Jerusalem, that he was altogether a papist; also of its being said that

he was receiving 200 ducats a year from the Propaganda: he wishes he were; and hopes the Holy Ghost may inspire the Nuncio to get such a pension for him, p. 540.

Supplement XXX. 1. Letter of 1 Nov. 1669 to the tsar from Dositheus now patriarch of Jerusalem: he had received in July at C.P. the tsar's letter written to Nectarius, now expatriarch, about P. Ligarides, 'asking that we should *absolve* him:' but he, Ligarides, has upon him unmentionable crimes and sins; and he is *not penitent:* he writes letters (one specimen of which is sent for the tsar to read) to certain friends of his, *heretics like himself*, full of foul-mouthed abuse of the expatriarch Nectarius; so that Dositheus could wish rather to give him over again the punishment he deserves. Nevertheless, since the tsar writes that '*he has brought his empire to a good end*' (*i.e.* out of its difficulties), he Dositheus, *of affection for the tsar* (also to obtain the tsar's alms), takes Ligarides' *impenitent* revilings as if they were a bouquet of sweet-smelling flowers; and, *by way of honour and praise for them*, holds him absolved from the *just* excommunications and curses of the patriarch Nectarius &c.: and he joins herewith, 2. a Letter of absolution for P. Ligarides. In this it is said that 'whereas he, Ligarides, has sinned in *certain points*, and *for his guilt* was put out *from the sacred ministration* and *from the clergy* by Kyr Nectarius *and by all the sacred synod* of Jerusalem. . . . and now the tsar has asked of us a pardon for him, we . . . hold the said P. Ligarides for absolved and blessed, and freed from all *excommunication* and curse. . . . Moreover we have *recommended* to our father Nectarius *and to all the synod*, that *they should absolve him likewise*,' &c. However, when this Letter of absolution was given at Moscow to P. Ligarides—the letter with which it came the tsar probably kept to himself—it was objected to by the Russian bishops as ambiguous and incomplete, p. 550.

Supplement XXXI. Letter of Paisius Ligarides to the tsar, contending against *some*, whom he does not name (but no doubt he alludes to the patriarch of Moscow Joasaph, who had been trying before to get rid of him, as appears, at p. 548, from his letter of 25 Sept. 1668 to the Dominican Schieretsky), that the above absolution of himself *is* regular, and sufficient, and petitioning 'for a righteous revision.' But he does not *now* claim to be considered *innocent* of those charges on which he had been *degraded and excommunicated* before he went as commissioner (in 1663) from the tsar and the Russian clergy to Voskresensk, there to whisper into the ear *of Nicon* (as he pretended afterwards) a suspicion of unmentionable sins, p. 557.

EPITOME OR DIGEST.

Pantaleon Ligarides of Scio, born about 1612, was in the Greek college at Rome sixteen years, 1626-1642, to the age of thirty: he took the degrees of doctor in philos. and theol. with great distinction; was ordained deacon and priest at Rome by Raphael Korsak, Ruthenian metr. of Little Russia. p. 13 (and *Replies* of Nicon, p. 550). In 1637 he published in a book of his fellow-student Neophytus Rodino an *Apology for Peter Arcudius*, dedicated to Urban VIII.; and in another tract of the same Neophytus, *On the Magnificat*, he printed a *Letter* to the archbishop of Naples. p. 2 (and *Replies* &c. p. 586). In 1642 he left Rome for Constantinople, counting perhaps on the favour of the then patriarch Parthenius I.: but he being soon forced to make way for another, Ligarides transferred himself to the Danubian principalities, and thence went to Poland and to Muscovy, where he died in 1678. In 1650 he served the metr. Stephen of Tergovist by assisting in the preparation of a Wallachian edition of the *Kormchay*, which was published in 1652; but his fixed employment in the principalities was that of teacher in the school founded by the Vasili Loupoulus, bey or hospodar of Moldavia, at Jassy. p. 4. Here he was of course known only as Orthodox; but he kept up his relations with his fellow-countryman Leo Allatius, and others of the Roman school, to whom he wrote as a Catholic. He gained the favour of Paisius patriarch of Jerusalem, who took him with him from Jassy, late in 1650, in company with Arsenius Souchanoff; and, having passed by Scio, they arrived on the 6th Oct. 1651 at Jerusalem. On Sunday 16th Nov. the patriarch tonsured him to be a monk (on which occasion he took from his patron the name of Paisius), and committed him to the charge of Arsenius Souchanoff, who was to be his novice-master. p. 5. Between that time and Easter 1652 (when Arsenius left) Jerusalem was visited by the patriarch Macarius of Antioch with his son and archdeacon Paul: they met there Arsenius Souchanoff; and they had personal knowledge of the fact that the patriarch Paisius ordained (that is, *reordained*, though he may have been unaware of it) Ligarides deacon and priest, p. 14, 422, 423; and according to his own account made him protopresbyter. While living at Jerusalem he compiled a *History of the Patriarchs of Jerusalem* down to Heraclius, but quite in a Latin sense; the Ms. of which work becoming known afterwards (Dositheus, who was first archdeacon to the patriarch Nectarius of Jerusalem, and then patriarch himself, made great use of it in his own similar *History*), was condemned, together with its author, who was anathematised *as a heretic* by the patriarchs Nectarius of Jerusalem

and Methodius of C.P. (so this probably was in 1667-1668). p. 6. But in the mean time, between 1652 and 1656, the patriarch Paisius of Jerusalem consecrated Ligarides bishop to the see of Gaza, with the title of metropolitan. Whether he ever resided there, nay even whether he was ever there at all, is doubted by Nicon in his *Replies*, p. 97. At any rate in 1656 1657 he was living again in Moldavia and Wallachia, where he was seen by the patriarch Macarius of Antioch. In 1657 Nicon, who had need of Greeks of intelligence and learning, having heard of him from Arsenius Souchanoff, and that he wished to go to Moscow, wrote to him inviting him thither. p. 89. He seems to have served Stephen bey of Moldavia in that intrigue by which he supplanted Vasili bey (*Replies*, p. 46) ; and afterwards, when both Stephen bey of Moldavia and Constantine bey of Wallachia had been deposed, in 1657, he fled after them into Transylvania, where he was robbed of all he had. p. 7. He was deposed, degraded, and excommunicated by the patriarch of Jerusalem Nectarius (the successor of Paisius) for crimes of which in 1669-1670 Dositheus then patriarch of Jerusalem wrote to the tsar Alexis that modesty did not allow him to name them. p. 547, 552, 551, 10, 94, 96, 99-101, 360, 392, 422, 425, 79. He was (according to Nicon in his *Replies*, p. 586) a long time in Poland, under the Polish king, and he said mass in all their kostels. Eugenius sometime metropolitan of Kieff, in his *Dict. of Eccles. Writers* &c., writes that he came to Moscow in 1660 with a letter from the patriarch of C.P. Parthenius IV. Koumkoum (Μογίλαλος), recommending him as fit to be employed in the affair of Nicon, p. 10. But this is inaccurate: he writes distinctly of himself that he came to Moscow ἰδιοθέλως, of his own will, without any invitation or mission, not to accuse or to judge Nicon, but on speculation, for the pecuniary needs of *his poor see;* and that he arrived first at Moscow on the 28th Apr. 1662. This he pleaded in 1666 to the tsar himself, when he begged to be dismissed before the arrival of the two patriarchs, then expected. He may no doubt have had his original letters of orders both Roman and Greek, and the letter given to him on his consecration to be a bishop; and a letter perhaps from the patriarch of C.P. Parthenius II. of a date somewhat earlier than 1650, with which he first went from C.P. to the Danubian principalities. But neither of himself, when he first came to Moscow, nor when canonical letters were demanded of him at Voskresensk in 1663 by the patriarch Nicon, did he even by his own account exhibit any letters, or pretend to have any. And for this reason Nicon refused to have anything to do with him, and warned the tsar of the impropriety and the sin of receiving such persons as came unaccredited.

Book I. *Of the Abdication of Nicon.*

The writer dedicates his *History* to the tsar Alexis, who, he thinks, will feel bound to defend it (*i.e.* cause it to be translated and published). p. 15. He *swears* by truth that it holds fast to truth, *without* either *rhetorical amplifications* or improper curtailments. They would be calumniators who should call it verbose, cunningly dishonest, partial and extravagant,

full of invective, overladen with accusations, and a mass of all manner of libels. p. 17. He is a simple man, straightforward and unpolished; who represents facts as he has known them, without undue favour or indulgence. Should any man, like Philoxenus, run down this history, let him remember how Philoxenus was thrown into the quarries at Syracuse *for not praising* the tragedies of *the tyrant*. p. 18. He has a firm standing-ground, an invulnerable panoply, in the tsar's protection. p. 20. All the virtues, all the graces, run up into the tsar: may he live to the age of Methuselah! p. 21. As a 'frontispiece' he gives a physiognomical portrait of Nicon, and exclaims: 'O, my eyes! what a monster!' p. 21; 'Strife and contention breathe in Nicon's form.' p. 27. In his introduction he says he will be scrupulously just, as an Areopagite; yea, by God omniscient, and by truth, *which I prize above all things;* and, like Socrates, I will be *even hypercritical* when I have to speak of myself or of them that were on the same side with me. p. 28.

Nicon, before becoming patriarch, had dissembled his true character, and seemed goodnatured, gentle, an ascetic, a lover of learning, a lover of the Greeks, and for his sermons like another Gregory the Divine. But when he had attained *his object* he threw off the mask, and showed himself such as he really was, a man of stone or oak, an intriguer, ambitious, revengeful, arrogant, inhuman, a hireling careless of the sheep, rioting in luxury, the slave of pleasures, affecting imperial titles, for every good work reprobate. p. 38, 39.

When he had been patriarch six years, and his iniquities cried aloud to heaven, God brought suddenly upon him the stroke of punishment. One of the tsar's archons, Bogdan Matv. Khitroff,[1] by *pushing slightly with the open palm of his hand* a servant of the patriarch (15th June 1658), *made a beginning of skirmishing*. p. 41. The patriarch the next morning threatened to excommunicate Bogdan; but the tsar begged him to abstain from any such excessive punishment for so small a cause. But the patriarch was deaf to these siren accents; he was like the deaf adder to these imperial incantations. And when on the 10th July the tsar, owing to a pressure of state business, could not go to the church, Nicon, being very suspicious, *imagined* an affront; and, after celebrating the liturgy, belched forth publicly curses on himself if he should ever again return to his chair or take the title of patriarch; and taking off his vestments one by one he said, 'I am no more patriarch!' so that he all but deposed and degraded himself. The tsar was astounded, and sent the first of his archons, Al. Nik. Troubetzkoy, to beg him to return to the chair, and not follow mere passion. But Nicon only became more fierce. So the tsar let the man go to be quiet for a while, trusting that afterwards by condescending letters and kind words he should heal his untimely mortification. But he only fell foul more and more fiercely of them that were sent to him, fighting and raging against them, pretending that he was unwilling (when he panted like a stag after it) to resume the patriarchate. p. 43.

[1] Called 'the whispering favourite.' See p. 536, 537; also Nicon's account, p. 52, 171, 381; that of Khitroff himself, the tsar, and the two Eastern patriarchs, p. 414, 421, 429; and the *act* of the Synod, p. 444.

At length [in the spring of 1660] a synod *was proclaimed* [by the tsar]: and they decreed that they considered Nicon to be no longer patriarch, and that none of the bishops should name him as such, or kiss his hand; going upon the fact of his own voluntary and absolute abdication. p. 43. But Nicon called this meeting 'a synagogue.' So he continued freely to ordain, and to celebrate the liturgy, as openly *warring with the tsar*, and contending against all the sacred synod. p. 46. But in truth it belonged *originally* to the *sovereign* both to convoke synods, and even to confirm their decrees. As for celebrating, some thought that Nicon *might* do this; but the greater number, and *especially our Roman bishops then at Moscow*, as following more closely the holy canons, said that he ought by no means to celebrate, having absolutely forsworn *his episcopal character*. p. 48. But the tsar, labouring for peace, thought it necessary to use some condescension; and there was found a precedent in the case of Eustathius, who, after resigning his see, was allowed by the Third œcumenical council to retain the name and honour of a bishop. But this was a most mistaken lenity; for it only emboldened Nicon (p. 50), who began afterwards to excommunicate and to anathematise individuals, and on one occasion, on the first Sunday of Lent (in A.D. 1660), even bishops, especially Pitirim the metropolitan of Kroutitz.

Things being in this state, there came to Moscow on the 28th of April 1662, ἰδιοθελῶς, of his own will, 'free and uncalled' (p. 50), not to dispute with Nicon nor to judge him, but to relieve *his see* [he having no see at the time] of the debt burdening it (p. 427), Paisius metr. of Gaza. Nicon, hearing of this, sent and asked Arsenius Souchanoff to visit the metropolitan of Gaza in his name, hoping that he might help to make peace between the patriarch and the emperor. The metropolitan of Gaza, without committing himself, sent a civil answer: and Nicon wrote to him a friendly letter, in which he detailed all that he had suffered. This letter was translated into Latin by Epiphanius Slavenetsky [*so by the tsar's order*]; and a copy of it is preserved in the *imperial archives*. The metropolitan of Gaza, *not without the imperial command*, replied. p. 51.

In his answer he wrote: 'Thy letter contained the drama of thy sufferings, *for which may God repay thee in the glorious day of retribution*. . . . But finding myself between two parties of combatants, I am at a loss to which side to turn. . . . A soldier once said to Hadrian: My horse carries me, *but the emperor feeds me*: I will say: The tsar *day by day bestows his grace upon me* [*i. e.* gives me a daily allowance], the patriarch prays for and blesses me: it shall be another Theophilus of Alexandria to judge between them, &c. *Thus*, had it been earlier, *I might have* preluded. But since the Eris has cast the apple of strife with the inscription '*Detur fortiori*' (Let the prize be to the stronger), she has occasioned a thousand scandals [and it is now too late]. Let us probe the first sources of this evil plethora. The true root of the mischief is *thy self-love*. From the time that thy beatitude *received* the title of *Great Hossoudar* the tares have sprung up abundantly: and I have been astonished that thou shouldest *magnify thyself* with this unusual title, &c. For, as Homer sings, 'Let there be one ruler, one king,' *like as there is one God*, and one sun among

the planets. . . . *I know that thy most reverend eminence looks to a right purpose and end.* Nevertheless it is said: Woe unto him by whom the *offences* shall have come! Every slight dishonour put upon a servant is not an insult to the patriarch, or to the tsar.[2] p. 59. Thou sayest that thou didst retire for good reasons, and didst shake off the dust of Moscow for a testimony against its disobedience. But that retirement was a thing needing caution, that there might not befall thee, as now there *has* befallen thee, the misfortune of Epimetheus. . . . Ye have both been made a spectacle to the world, Alexis and Nicon, to see which of you shall obtain the palm of victory, the prize of the contest. Nicon cries aloud, '*Repent!*' Alexis cries, 'He that abideth unto the end shall be saved;' adding, 'Let it alone even this year also; and if it bear fruit of *obedience*, well; but if not, then after that thou shalt cut it down.' . . . If thou dost not shepherd the sheep *in the usual way, as caring for them*, thou art *a hireling*. p. 61. How long wilt thou *forget* thy flock? How long wilt thou be fixed in thy fury? . . . But I come to the capital point of thy arguments, which if we can demolish, we may then erect our trophy, and inscribe on it: 'The victory is with the emperor Alexis!' 'The emperor,' thou sayest, 'judges ecclesiastical causes,' &c. &c. But these things, and things exactly like to these, thou wilt find in the holy scriptures to be the customary and hereditary *rights* of kings. . . . It is the special *right* of the king to judge others, and not to be judged by others. p. 65. The most christian emperor showers on all his gifts. . . . And I above all will shout like a Stentor, to proclaim *his boundless liberality towards myself*. Hast thou the *heart* to *attack* our divinely-graced autocrat and most legitimate heir of the Roman monarchy? Gracious! What respect did he show thee . . . so that often *the most illustrious bogars* of the council *were scandalised* at such humility! Remember his innumerable acts of goodness to thee, how *he*[3] promoted thee. It is a grievous thing for thee to kick against the pricks, and ungratefully darken with the depths of Lethe the draughts of his sweet graces, which thou hast swallowed down in rivers. . . . Fall not to curses for petty causes, and occasions taken from dogs[4] . . . and blame not *our Asiatic loquacity*, which is spurred *only* by the œstrus of charity, &c. &c. Dated the 12th July 1662. p. 69.

Nicon, on reading this letter, cried out: 'I appeal to the Pope![5] Not that he thought of the Pope, or had any inward agreement with him (for *how should he, having been from his birth ignorant of all these things, and uninitiated?*) . . . And he alleged the council of Sardica, which enacts that the bishop of Rome is by all means to examine the sentences of the other bishops. p. 70. He then says that after some time he was called to the palace of the patriarchate, to a meeting held solely to investigate the feigned appeal of Nicon to the Pope; also, whether the faith of the Russians really came from Byzantium, and at what time they became Christians? On these subjects the Russians applied for information to Paisius, and Paisius enlightened them. p. 72.

[2] Suppose then that the patriarch's servant had *similarly*, and in public, struck an officer of the tsar on duty?

[3] See Nicon's *Replies*, p. 206, 222.

[4] See p. 426; and Nicon's *Replies*, p. xxi. xxxix. 16.

[5] Ib. p. xxi. and 620.

Thenceforth the fame of the metropolitan of Gaza was in all the court; and he was often called upon by the council to answer questions; on which occasions a Muscovite named Lucian, who knew *Latin*, was his interpreter. Especially the boyar Sim. Luc. Streshneff,[6] the tsar's maternal uncle, addressed to him in writing xxx. Questions,[7] embodying all the *demands of Nicon*, some of which, since they are of great importance to this history, I will append[8] at the end of it. The xxx. Answers which I wrote in Latin were translated into Slavonic *by the tsar's translator* Stephen; and many eagerly *received* them, and wrote copies of them. At last one of these copies fell into the hands of Nicon, who sought an opportunity of revenging himself.[9] p. 74. By and by, one day in Lent, in 1663, he was called for privately,[10] and asked by the grandees how the Church might be delivered from her widowhood? He replied that this might easily be managed, if only the tsar would accept his advice, and go through with it. Hereupon the tsar himself appeared, and asked his advice. He replied: Send letters to the œcumenical patriarchs, stating Nicon's demands or presumptions: so you will at once obtain your object. The tsar said: I must have a little time to think, and to consult with my boyars, and then I will call for thee again. In the mean time, give me *thy* hearty *blessing*: ἦκεν γὰρ, ὡς λέγουσιν, εὐτυχεῖ πόδι. p. 75.

Ligarides also wrote on the 9th June 1663 a letter to the tsar, suggesting a personal motive to quicken him, and advising also that the letters to the patriarchs should be *written* at once *in Greek*, for greater secrecy, *i.e.* by himself. So they were written with xxv. leading Questions; and Ligarides also recommended to be their bearer a Greek deacon named Meletius, a friend of his own (against whom, as a man of bad character and an adept in forgery, Nicon warned the tsar). Meletius was also to inform the patriarchs orally about Nicon, who was not named in the Questions; and to suggest how the Answers should be worded. So the letters were written *privately*; and Meletius *with liberal presents* &c. set out A.D. 1664, Jan. 1 [perhaps 1663, Sept. 1]. p. 76.

Meantime Nicon, spreading out certain letters of the tsar on a lectern in the church of his monastery, caused to be read or sung Psalm cviii. containing the words, 'Let his children be orphans, and his wife a widow: let his days be few,' &c.; and he was denounced for this at Moscow as having publicly cursed the tsar. The tsar called all the bishops together,

[6] Who nicknamed his dog 'Nicon,' and taught the same dog to sit up and to mimic the gesture of the patriarch in giving the blessing. See Nicon's *Replies*, p. xxxix. 16, and Appendix VI. to the *Travels of Macarius* &c. p. 481.

[7] Manifestly suggested by himself, after he had learned what they had to tell him about Nicon, and what they wished: and so Nicon himself in his *Replies* observes to Streshneff, p. 30.

[8] This he has not done: but see Supplement III. p. 313, and *Replies* &c. p. xxvii.

[9] Who wrote upon it his Replies or Objections, which, however, were not then shown, and copied among the nobles of the council as Ligarides' Answers were: he also wrote to the tsar warning him of the danger and the sin incurred by receiving stranger ecclesiastics unaccredited. See p. 78, 81, 391, and Nicon's *Replies*, p. 670, 671.

[10] *i.e.* probably by the boyar Simeon Streshneff, and introduced informally, as if

and told *us:* we all blushed with shame, and besought him for a searching investigation. Again he summoned both the synod and the council of state; and by *common consent* the metropolitan of Gaza was appointed to be the *chief commissioner for the clergy*, and the prince Niketa Iv. Odoefsky [the compiler of the *Code* of 1649] to be the chief commissioner for the boyars; and they all went to Voskresensk, with a body of soldiers, on the 17th July 1663. p. 76, 77.

Nicon, hearing of the soldiers, thought they were going to send him into exile; and hearing of the metropolitan of Gaza being there, he objected that he was a foreigner, whom he would not receive without the exhibition of canonical letters. p. 78. The boyar replied: He will come and make his own excuses.[11] So he went with the rest; and Nicon (who denied having cursed the tsar), after staring at him fiercely, asked why he wore a red or red-striped mandya? to which he replied: 'Because I am from the *true* Jerusalem, and not from *thy* Jerusalem, which is neither the new nor the old, but a third, *perhaps that of the Antichrist to come.*' Again, Nicon asked, 'Why dost thou not speak in Greek, which is thy native dialect, but only in the accursed tongue of the Latins?' 'However' (Ligarides pretends he replied), 'this is the tongue you will hear from the Pope, when you go to Rome *with your appeal.* What have you to do with the Pope, tell me, by the Graces? Tongues, moreover, are not to be cursed. Again: I do not speak in Greek because thou knowest not so much as the alphabet in this tongue. Nevertheless I *will* speak to thee, and whisper in thy ear *something in Romaic: Thou——!*' [an unmentionable word is here implied to have been whispered] 'strict maintainer of the canons, whence hast thou learned to clothe beardless boys in monastic garb?' p. 79.

Finally (he writes), we re-entered our own lodging utterly wearied and disgusted. Neither did we [*i. e.* Ligarides and his Greek attendants] dare to go to the church (the next day being Sunday) after the horrors of the day before; but we sat by ourselves, and waited for the rest of our company: and they remained very late: for Nicon, having ascended his false Golgotha, preached thence, saying: 'Already has come the band of the soldiers, and Herod and Pilate are ready in the judgment-hall (alluding to the boyars Herodion and Niketa); yea and he also (Almiaz Ivanoff) who may answer to Judas: there have come also the high-priests Annas and Caiaphas' (the metropolitan of Gaza and the archbishop Joseph of Astrachan). The boyars made an *energetic* report to the tsar: they *detected* Nicon preparing *to go out;* prevented him, and set guards around the monastery. But after two days there came from the tsar orders for us to return. And when we arrived, and had given our blessing to the tsar, and had kissed his hand, he immediately, with a gracious smile, said to me: 'Well; have you now yourself seen Nicon?' And I replied, 'Yea, by truth, it had been better for me never to have seen such a monster; better to be blind and deaf at once, than to see him, or to come within

[11] Really, he said, 'Well, he *has* a *letter.*' See the official report: and Nicon's *Replies*, p. 587. And when he came before Nicon, and had no letters to exhibit, Nicon refused to have anything to do with him. It was said indeed: 'He *has* a letter: but it is with the tsar:' but Nicon replied, '*That* then is nothing to *me.*'

hearing of him!' . . . Nicon, by the way, *sent libels against me to the tsar*, . . . making apologies for having behaved roughly to me [really warning the tsar how he was offending against the canons], and a thousand other charges he let out besides. p. 82.

To return to the mission of Meletius: he arrived at C.P. where he found also the patriarch of Jerusalem, Nectarius: and he, Nectarius, with difficulty persuaded the patriarch of C.P., Dionysius, to receive the tsar's letters. However he did receive them; and he bade the envoy live as privately as possible. The issue was, that a formal document or tomes (these being one and the same document in duplicate) was composed, but anonymously, as against some bishop who was acting disorderly, in the form of xxv. Questions and Answers.[12] These were sent to the other two patriarchs, and subscribed *by all the four;* and in due time they were sent to Jassy, and there delivered by the patriarch of Jerusalem, Nectarius, to Meletius, who arrived with them at Moscow on Whitsunday, 29th May 1664.[13] But Athanasius metropolitan of Iconium, who was then at Moscow, contested the genuineness of the patriarchal signatures, p. 83: and though he was confuted, the tsar sent Meletius a second time to the Levant, and together with him another Greek of Andros named Stephen, a relative of the patriarch Dionysius of C.P., not only to obtain fresh assurance that the patriarchal tomes received were genuine, but also to persuade the patriarchs, or two of the four at least, and other Eastern bishops to come personally to Moscow. So they left Moscow 25th Sept. 1664, and parting from one another, Stephen went first, with a secretary of the tsar named Porphyry, to the patriarch Nectarius of Jerusalem, who was then for alms in the country of the Albani (and as he was vacillating, letters reached him from C.P. which convinced him that he could not safely go to Russia): and from him Stephen went on to C.P. (p. 84, 361, 359, 360): but Meletius went to Egypt, and thence to Mount Sinai, and to Georgia (where the patriarch of Antioch was in 1665 collecting alms); and by his *honeyed* discourses, his *most sweet* eloquence, his most *gold-beaming* strings of words, he persuaded the patriarchs Paisius of Alexandria and Macarius of Antioch, and other Eastern metropolitans, to undertake to come to Moscow. p. 85.

Nicon, on hearing of this, gnashed his teeth: and about the middle of the night preceding the Sunday next before Christmas, 18th Dec. 1664, he unexpectedly reappeared in the cathedral at Moscow, and was received by the clergy who were there. News of this was carried across to the palace. The tsar was thunderstruck; and wondered whence *such impudent audacity* could have originated. Instantly he summoned all the council, and all the bishops: I therefore also was called in haste: and as I drew near to the palace, I saw many lights lighted there, and an indescribable

[12] Probably a project or rough draft of the Answers desired was prepared and sent from Moscow together with the Questions by Ligarides himself.

[13] Nectarius sent also a separate letter of his own to the tsar, advising him to recall Nicon to his chair: he added too a letter for Nicon: and these he sent by a separate messenger, who was thrown into prison for his pains. See Supplment VII. p. 350-356, 457.

blaze of torches below: and if there had been a hostile army approaching, there could not well have been a greater confusion or clamour. Verily then *the tsar was indignant*, the boyars shouted at the top of their voices, the bishops muttered Hospodi pomilui! (Kyrie eleïson!) and called on God, saying *Boje moi!* (Mon Dieu!), shaking their heads. All hurried pell-mell up the stairs of the palace. After some space the tsar asked *anxiously, what was to be done?* And I, the metropolitan of Gaza, said: Let him be asked how he has come in hither, and who invited him, that he has mounted suddenly, *like a thief and an invader*, the patriarchal throne? Paul the metropolitan of Kroutitz was sent to question him, together with certain lords. But Nicon, drawing back, said: 'Who are you?' He replied: 'I have recently *been consecrated* metropolitan, and so now I wear the usual robes.' Nicon sent a sealed letter to the tsar, who having with difficulty received it, opened it, and read it before all. It gave an account of a *vision*, in obedience to which Nicon had returned to Moscow. All with one accord cried out: 'Let this seer of empty revelations—this buffoon of a man—depart from us with all speed; *that there be not any rising of the people.*' So three of us bishops, Paul of Kroutitz, Paisius of Gaza, and Theodosius of Servia [two of the three being strangers, living on the tsar's alms], and three boyars were sent to bid him be gone before sunrise: so, casting a glance of rage at us, and having privily seized the pastoral staff of St. Peter, he went out hastily; and having shaken off the dust from his feet, and having bade his attendants do the like, he fled off in haste. But the tsar sent after him; and he was at last forced to give up the staff: and he confessed in terms that instead of a divine revelation, a certain boyar had desired him to come to Moscow; and he gave up his letter; so making himself a traitor Judas by betraying the secrets of his friend, who was thrown into chains, and lost his property, his wife, and his own life. p. 89.

The envoy Stephen had a private interview at C.P. with the patriarch Dionysius[14] and the patriarch having received *from him* and having read the tsar's letters, bade him *not show himself* at the patriarchate, but only at the house of the domina Roxandra, as she should be the medium through which to manage all details. About the scandal caused by the metropolitan of Iconium he *wrote a suitable answer to the tsar*, appointing, moreover, the metropolitan of Gaza, Paisius, *interpreter of the two patriarchal tomes;* yea, and the *most confidential mouthpiece of all the synod*, as is contained in the patriarchal letter of instructions to him, which is *preserved in the imperial archives.*[15] On his return Stephen was confronted with Athanasius, who still brazened it out, and who, after being again confuted, was confined in the Simonoff till the arrival of the patriarchs, or rather *till his untimely death.* p. 90 and 369.

[14] But Dionysius himself, being asked afterwards, said that he *never received him*, nor gave him any letters, though the Chartophylax did *ask him* to give a letter in favour of Ligarides; see p. 359, 360, 363.

[15] Here it is noted on the margin of the MS. by a contemporary hand that '*this is a lie*,' the writer knowing, though he will not name him, the man who forged this pretended letter of the patriarch of C.P. in favour of Ligarides.

To the request of the tsar, that the patriarch Dionysius [if he could not come himself] would send some bishop as a representative of the œcumenical chair, the patriarch replied, that this request, if it were to be complied with without great danger, should have been addressed to the sultan. And an embassy was in fact sent to the sultan, 6th Jan. 1666, ostensibly only to negotiate with him to put a stop to the continual incursions of the Tatars into Little and White Russia. The envoy Bas. Dmitrieff was to go from Azak to Adrianople, where the sultan was. p. 91.

Also the tsar sent the kellar of the Choudoff, named Sabbas, to Kyr Dionysius, now expatriarch, and metropolitan of Thessalonica, on account of the difference and contention between the two Andrians, Athanasius and Stephen. Dionysius told him that all[16] was genuine, and dismissed him, without however giving him any writing. So he departed, and went to C.P. to the œcumenical patriarch Parthenius, who would not listen so much as with the tips of his ears to the requests Sabbas had to make, observing strictly the engagement made by him with the vizir Kupriuli. So Sabbas returned without any success.[17]

Then he relates how he was robbed, 21st Dec. 1664, by a deacon, Agathangelus, who had been banished and imprisoned till he obtained his release and took him into his service; and how the same Agathangelus went to Voskresensk to Nicon, and made deposition of a thousand calumnies, which he belched out against the metropolitan of Gaza, both by writing and by word of mouth.

In 1665, Feb. 25th, the tsar, in consequence of having received a petition from all the bishops in Moscow (that is from Paul, whom they had made metropolitan of Kroutitz, and three others, all foreigners living on the tsar's alms), sent Kyr Joachim archimandrite of the Choudoff, and the secretary Dementius Bashmakoff, to Nicon (then in his hermit pillar where he used to pass Lent), to demand of him a written judgment respecting the propriety of confessing and communicating condemned felons [in the expectation that he would write something that could be laid hold of as contrary to the canons]. Nicon promised to do so: and the synod remained expecting his composition with the greatest eagerness. But would to God it had never come to light! for it emptied out upon me insultingly all the dregs of *idle gossip*, bringing forward a thousand calumnies which should not have been uttered publicly. p. 96; see too p. 392, 79, 427, 551, 558.

Before Agathangelus had been set at liberty, *i.e.* before he went to Voskresensk, Nicon had *already* sent to Moscow the stories *fabricated* against me, at the bare reading of which the tsar was *utterly shocked*. And having called for the metropolitan of Gaza, with certain special individuals of the nobles, he showed them the letters of Nicon. The

[16] 'All,' *i.e.* all that had been received, not only the Answers and subscriptions of the tomes, but also the forged letter obtained afterwards by Stephen, written to make Ligarides patriarchal exarch or deputy.

[17] Really he brought information unfavourable to Paisius himself, and to his friends and agents Meletius and Stephen; and so very little was communicated to him about that mission. See p. 360, 363, 547.

metropolitan of Gaza said: 'If there be only so much as one of all these calumnies found to be true, I consent to be held guilty of all; but if I succeed in showing any one of them to be false, I claim to be acquitted of all.' The tsar said: 'The present time is not convenient' (for it was just the end of Lent), 'but after Easter week there shall be a searching investigation.' . . . *After this*, on Palm Sunday, wishing to gladden the metropolitan of Gaza in his tribulation, *he presented to him a very handsome mitre*. Nicon heard of this, and gnashed his teeth: and still more when he learned in addition that at the Lavanda the metropolitan of Gaza had represented St. Peter. p. 100. After the Sunday of St. Thomas, the metropolitan of Gaza wrote a petition for investigation. 'For though,' he said, 'I *ought to be judged by my own patriarch Nectarius*[18] (see p. 551, 553), *still* of my own free will I submit myself to this synod of the Russian bishops.' p. 100; and compare p. 300.

Hereupon the tsar commanded that the heads should meet at the palace to examine strictly as to these two points: 1. whether the metropolitan of Gaza is *orthodox* (see p. 4 and 547); and 2. whether he cultivates the art of magic, and vain astrological calculations (see p. 548). There were introduced in his favour a myriad of trustworthy witnesses, who said that his accusers were *simply liars*. And Agathangelus being brought in in chains was proved to be a slanderer; and he was kept *in irons till* he sued for grace, having first publicly declared that all that had been said and written against the metropolitan of Gaza was false. . . . A complete acquittal[19] was pronounced afterwards, on a review of the matter, by *the three patriarchs*. For so soon as the coming of the two patriarchs was announced, *all was economically hushed up* and allowed to go to sleep,

[18] Nectarius became patriarch of Jerusalem in 1660, and Ligarides came to Moscow in 1662 without such letters as he would naturally have brought had he not been already degraded and excommunicated. Nectarius, like Ligarides himself, resided much more at C.P. or in the Danubian principalities than at Jerusalem; and it seems that Ligarides when condemned by him was still in Moldavia, and that he allowed judgment to go by default, and went off on that account first to Poland, and afterwards to Russia, while Nectarius sent the act of his condemnation to be assented to, registered, and carried out by the local synod at Jerusalem. The public anathema of his *History of the Patriarchs of Jerusalem*, and of his person in connection with it, at C.P. in 1667 or 1668, need not have been connected with any mention of other crimes besides heresy (though it is true that the ex-patriarch Dionysius in 1666 says of him not only that he is no scion of the Church of C.P. and a heretic, but also that he is '*a bad man*'); and, besides, *this* was the act of Dositheus himself, and so it is plainly distinct from that earlier excommunication which Dositheus ascribes altogether to Nectarius, saying that 'he is not a man to say anything false or to do anything unjust.' p. 551.

[19] *i. e.* they owned him for a brother, asked for him to be their instructor, let him sit with them, and speak, and vote in the synod, and subscribe its acts, concelebrated and communicated with him, and accepted his ordinations, and let him join with them in consecrating a new Patriarch: all this they did; because so it suited the tsar and the boyars. But had it not been for this, he would of himself have thought it necessary or prudent to make off before the two patriarchs arrived at Moscow (p. 427): and as soon as his services were no longer needed he found the new patriarch desirous of getting rid of him (p. 548), and he himself, without pretending any longer to clear himself, desired only such an *absolution* as the tsar's influence might be able to obtain for him. p. 558.

as there was need to turn to other matters [and to use Ligarides in those matters]. p. 101.

Meantime, while Nicon was *sleeping*, a new kind of tares (the Russian starobratsi) had sprung up: and the tsar determined to make more bishops. So the metropolitan Pitirim [in 1664] was promoted [under the blessing and initiative of Ligarides] to Novgorod, and the archimandrite Paul was made metropolitan of Kroutitz; Cornelius (4th June 1664) was consecrated archbishop of Siberia, Simeon of Vologda [but he was bishop there already], and Arsenius of Pskoff. And after a time *all the bishops* were convoked to a general synod, very agreeably to the canons.

So, being assembled (in 1666), they considered all the acts and conduct of Nicon since his public abdication; and the former synodical decision and declaration of the bishops, p. 103: also the conduct of the metropolitan Jonah (who had set the rest an example for taking Nicon's blessing in Dec. 1661) was carefully considered, and it was decided that he had acted involuntarily, from confusion and surprise. So they were all pardoned. p. 105. Against the new schismatics led by Lazarus, Abbakoum, Epiphanius, Niketa, Nicanor, Thyrsoff, Gregory Neronoff, and others, we (Paisius of Gaza), by command of the tsar and the synod, composed a book (the *Staff of Rule*), overthrowing point by point the doctrines of Niketa, which afterwards in an abridged form was translated into Russ by Simeon of Polotsk, and printed. p. 108. And three bishops were distinguished for their zeal against those schismatics, who nominally accusing Nicon really reproached us Romans (*i.e.* Greeks) as having swerved from orthodoxy. These were Paul metropolitan of Kroutitz, Paisius of Gaza, and Hilarion archbishop of Riazan. p. 110.

At length the patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch were announced to be approaching, having come from Georgia and Persia by the Caspian sea to Astrachan, where the archbishop Joseph and the voivode prince James Nik. Odoefsky received them. p. 112. The tsar wrote, 14th Sept. 1666, to welcome them: writing in his letter that they 'for Christ's sake *alone* have undertaken this long journey' [but later he wrote to the patriarch of C.P. that it was *in order to obtain his alms*]; expressing 'confidence that through their beatitudes the present *scandals* will cease, and the storms be turned into a calm.' And again, 13th Oct., he writes of 'the long journey full of toils, pains, and perils which they have gone through as athletes for Christ's Church, and *solely* for its peace and settlement *unto edification*.' p. 117. The patriarchs, encouraged by these letters, went forward with joy, and all prepared for their reception: one single individual alone, viz. Nicon, was troubled and annoyed. And now the *storm-demon*, which, sailing *in the ship against our will*, had *sought to cast us out*, was *himself to be cast out instead;* and so all was to become calm. p. 118.

Book II. *Final Deposition of Nicon.*

First, he gives addresses of welcome made to the two patriarchs, with language like that quoted above: *e.g.* the metropolitan of Riazan said: 'Come and give to our emperor *that peace which God loves*, to set up trophies of victory over *his enemies*.' p. 120. And Paul metro-

politan of Kroutitz: 'Ye have done the will *of the Lord*, and fulfilled the *duty* of *superintending the flock*, in that *from your lofty watch-tower regarding also this flock*, ye made haste to stretch out a helping hand by coming hither as soon as ye had learned what straits oppressed it owing to the *transgression* of its shepherd, and *his most gross neglect*. And ye, as imitators of Christ, seeking *not at all* your own interests, but regarding *only* the common good of Christ's Church, have come hither with speed.' p. 121. And Pitirim metropolitan of Novgorod: 'The tsar and the synclete rejoice, and all the people, that the Russian Church is now to be delivered from her *widowhood*.' p. 123.

The patriarchs having made their entry, 2 Nov., were lodged in the podvorie of the Kyrilloff monastery [where the patriarch Macarius had been before, A.D. 1655 and 1656]. On Sunday the 4th they had their first audience; and the tsar said that he trusted 'that through them the Russian Church should be healed, like the woman with the issue of blood, from her plague; she that in time past *was deserted for some secret and unknown sins;* by touching even the hems of your garments: for grace in very deed and power goes out of you, and heals all those that approach *with faith*.' . . . 'Thou, O successor of Mark, and true successor of Peter, Paisius of Alexandria, hast gone forth like a flash of lightning to scatter darkness, looking *only* to the straight and equal rule of right and justice and of piety. And thou, O most blessed Macarius, hast emulated Paul. Ye shall, I am assured, be abundantly rewarded for your labours both in this world *and in the next*.' p. 126.

Ligarides, knowing himself to have been degraded *and excommunicated* by his own patriarch Nectarius, and that the other patriarchs and Greek bishops could scarcely be all ignorant of this fact, had been unwilling to meet them, and had begged the tsar to dismiss him before their arrival (see p. 427): but the tsar having overruled his scruples, he also now presented himself with an address of welcome: 'In truth,' he said, 'the four patriarchs of the universe were invited to Moscow not once only but twice; and the letters of the tsar were made out, and would before have been sent and delivered, had not the serpent of envy creeping in, and having a great jealousy of this general assembly [plenary or œcumenical council] of the evergreen trees, interposed obstacles, and hindered it with his evil eye, like Cronus and the Gorgons and Medusa. Nevertheless ye two, of your compassion, have come. . . . Yea, O shepherds of shepherds, take pity on this flock of the Russians, your children: guide *us, as vigilant helmsmen of the universal Church*, to a fair haven: for doing which ye shall receive both *here* a reward a hundredfold, and in the world to come everlasting life,' &c. The patriarchs replied: 'We thank thee, and we respond to thy good wishes with *fraternal* prayers and benedictions. May the angel of the Lord carry thee on *from virtue to virtue*,' &c. p. 127. Simeon of Potolsk too [who had come into Muscovy from Lithuania in 1655, and who after the death of the tsar Alexis showed himself an admirer of Nicon] now visited the patriarchs, and made an address to them in Latin, which was translated into Greek by Ligarides [It reads however as if it had been his own writing from the beginning].

'Ye,' he says, 'are truly the eyes of the world, which *direct our feet* into the straight path of sincere piety and holiness; by which the Catholic Church, steered by your heavenly skill, passes over the waves of time well and prosperously, much better than the Argo which was piloted by Jason. . . . Ye are the two olive-trees, to communicate wisdom and holiness to Russia, which prays unceasingly that the oil of mercy may not fail in her vessels, and that when the bridegroom comes suddenly in that momentous night, she may not be shut out outside the door,' &c. p. 131. Then he proves at length that synods are lawful, and profitable: by them the Holy Ghost speaks: many eyes, like the many-eyed Argus, who had a hundred eyes like the coloured eyes of a peacock's tail, see more and see better than the single eye of the Gorgon, or the most solitary eye of the Cyclops Polyphemus [meaning Nicon]. p. 134.

Again another question: The tsar sent letters to the four patriarchs begging them to come to Moscow, to review and judge the case of the *ex*patriarch Nicon who had ill-administered the patriarchal power. But *some* said that it belonged only to ecclesiastical persons, not to potentates, to call a synod. *They* insisted that the power of judging (κανονίζειν) the Churches has been given to the Bishop of Rome, and that the confirmation of every synod lies with him; and the same was confirmed by the Novells of Justinian. But in reply to this and the like objections, we shall adduce a multitude of testimonies, quoting Socrates, &c. p. 135. . . . So it was competent, in like manner, for our emperor Alexis &c., admitting at the same time that the emperors *by no means* convoke synods *by compulsory command* (see Nicon's *Replies*, p. 40, 102, 103), but *only by friendly request*. p. 138. Unquestionably, then, this synod of Moscow was legitimately convoked by *our* emperor, who both issued the letters and defrayed the charges for the convocation, the preparation, and the holding of it. No wonder, then, if we should in this History often dilate upon the tsar's praises. For the monarch Alexis himself is both the beginning and the middle and the end of this splendid theme, p. 140. Again it was *synodically* considered, what such a meeting as this is to be called? And since in it there will be present the emperor Alexis, and two patriarchs (and there were only two present at Nice), and all the local bishops, and many other distinguished bishops from the Eastern patriarchates, it might justly be said to have *the form and appearance of an œcumenical*[29] *synod*. Still it cannot *properly* be called an œcumenical synod, because there is no *dogma* of faith to be defined in it, but only a definitive *judgment* against the *lawless* Nicon, who *has been* lawfully deposed *by the patriarchal censers*, and by the episcopal vote of the all-wise local synod [of 1666, confirmed in the spring of 1666], which passed its judgment *without any manner of partiality*, through the *ministerial assistance* of our divinely-guided *emperor*. p. 147. . . . Let those rave on, and go, with bad luck to them, to the ravens, who say (*and among them Nicon is one*) that the Eastern patriarchs no longer enjoy the divine power because they have been expelled from their patriarchal thrones through the violence of the

[29] *Such* Nicon thought it *ought* to be, if it was to judge him: see p. 390, 371, 433; Mouravieff's *History of the Russian Church*, p. 234.

unbelieving Gentiles: for *where* the patriarch is, there also is the patriarchal and apostolic chair. Wherefore also it is a trite saying, that where the Pope is, there is Rome, as when the Roman Pontiff resided in France. p. 149.

At the first meeting of the synod in the *Zolotaia palata* of the palace (7th Nov. p. 155 &c. 416 &c.), the emperor, before the two patriarchs and the most sacred synod *and the most splendid synclete*, made a speech, saying: 'In truth I shall be most happy if *the work aimed after* shall be brought to a good end, so that I procure peace to the church, *or rather to the empire*, which has been torn asunder, *like Penthens and Osiris*, into many fragments and schisms. One thing only I am sure of, that God will be the just rewarder of them who contend' [*for Him*]. To which all responded '*Amen!*'

Then there were produced the two patriarchal Tomes [of 1664] which had been subscribed by the four œcumenical patriarchs, and which had been translated *about this time* from the Greek into Russ by Paisius the metropolitan of Gaza. And there were read out from them the most important parts. After which the bishops present were asked by the two patriarchs whether Nicon was obnoxious to judgment according to those accusations and answers. All cried out aloud, 'Yes, he is!' and the first of them, Pitirim, added that there were many other offences besides, of which Nicon had been found guilty, though these were the most flagrant.

Then there were handed to the patriarchs libels containing the chief charges against Nicon in a succinct form (whence I have here compiled a spicilegium) to be studied in their cells; and the emperor named two Russian bishops, *Paul metropolitan of Kroutitz, and Hilarion metropolitan of Riazan*, to go over the charges with them. They expressed their satisfaction; but added *of themselves*: 'Do us the favour to give us yet a third bishop *of our own tongue*, that is, *Paisius of Gaza, who is not ignorant of the affair of Nicon.*' '*He is yours from this moment*,' the emperor replied: 'from him ye can learn *all*.' p. 156.

This *kakiarch*, originally poorer than Irus, having been raised to the patriarchate, with the mad ambition of Lucifer *attempted to set his own chair above those of the other patriarchs*:[21] at last, as a mule he kicked his own *benefactor*,[22] and as a viper wounded by his senseless *ingratitude* the great church of Christ, and like Plato's 'horse' (Aristotle) *bit* at his *master*. He elbowed aside the patriarch of Jerusalem by writing himself 'Patriarch of the *New Jerusalem*:' *he sought*, through a spurious document,[23] to filch from the see of Antioch the *third* place: he wronged the œcumenical chair of C.P. by seizing to himself the illustrious chair of Kieff,[24] styling himself 'Patriarch of all Great, *Little*, and White Russia.'

[21] See Nicon's *Replies*, p. 54, 158.

[22] Ibid. p. 206, 222, 270.

[23] By printing a document in which it appeared incidentally that *the tsar Theodore Iv. had desired* this. But *Nicon* rejoiced that no such uncanonical innovation had been introduced. See *Replies* &c. p. 54, and Mouravieff's *History* &c. p. 132.

[24] He anathematised Pitirim for invading it (*Replies* &c. p. 158). As for the *style* introduced by the tsar into public documents, the patriarch of C.P. Paisius himself, in 1654-1655, reproduces it in his letters. See *Travels of Macarius* &c. p. 28; and Appendix v. p. 463, and ii. p. 408, 416.

p. 333. He devised[25] a new sophism against the patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch, as if the desolation of those cities made them to be out of their sees. Hatching plots, weaving mischiefs, suggesting words ['great hossoudar'] *manifestly originating from himself*, he overleaped all the former bounds, so that Nicon was *the only head to be heard of*:[26] he dared to change the old customs of the four patriarchates; wearing a red-striped mandya,[27] using a looking-glass and a comb in the church;[28] casting into fetters and setting free of his own will;[29] blessing the water at the Theophany once[30] only, &c. How, then, can he do otherwise than incur the treble anathema of canon ii. of the Sixth council? p. 160. This man was *re-ordained*[31] when already a bishop; and he himself re-ordained two others: he would not call the bishops his '*brethren*';[32] he called their local synod 'a synagogue';[33] he called orthodox bishops[34] in the church Annas and Caiaphas: he had himself painted in the church while still living;[35] he coveted[36] and assumed the title of 'Great Hossoudar,' belonging to secular rulers (see p. 331-333): he *squandered the revenues of his see* (see p. 334, 335, and 506, 507), of vanity, on his own useless foundations; *seizing lawlessly*[37] the lands of *the surrounding proprietors* (see p. 192, 194): he shouted like a bacchanal, claiming to himself separate jurisdiction, giving up none to be judged, but committing himself all judgment to *laymen*[38] who *are used to sell* the scales of justice. At length the just God smote with madness him whom he would destroy; and Nicon ran headlong into the pit which he had dug with his own hands; and like another Haman he was hanged on his own gallows, which he had prepared for Mordecai. As a new Epimetheus, *without consulting any of the bishops favourable to him*, he entered the cathedral full of wrath and pride, and after celebrating the liturgy deposed himself by a sort of suicide, &c. p. 166.

All the bishops met 28 Nov., and *discussed* the question whether Nicon must be summoned. Some were well pleased with the decision of the patriarchal tomes, which *distinctly signified* that this was *by no means necessary*,[39] as the charges against him were already clearly established by trustworthy[40] witnesses. Nevertheless it was the *voice of the majority* that it was *by all means necessary*.

[25] *Refuted* rather, by retorting it; and with the greater force, because *he* was *not*, *like those patriarchs*, residing out of his own proper see or eparchy. See Nicon's *Replies* &c. p. 97, 98, &c.

[26] *Travels of Macarius*, p. 166, and Appendix VII. p. 488, 490.

[27] See Supplement XIII. p. 401.

[28] See below, p. 484; *Replies* &c. p. 20; and *Travels* &c. p. 80.

[29] See Mouravieff's *History* &c. p. 196.

[30] See below, p. 207, 484; and *Travels* &c. p. 279, 315.

[31] See below, p. 263; and *Replies* &c. p. 13-16, 660; Mouravieff's *History* &c. p. 129.

[32] See *Replies* &c. p. 68.

[33] See p. 46; and *Replies* &c. p. 40-43.

[34] *i.e.* on the 18th July 1663: see p. 434, 445; and *Replies* &c. p. 586-604.

[35] See p. 21, and *Travels of Macarius* &c. p. 268.

[36] See *Replies* &c. p. 66.

[37] Ibid. p. 585.

[38] Ibid. p. 292-388.

[39] So they were *meant* perhaps by Ligarides, when he made the first draft of them, to '*signify distinctly*;' but as finally worded and subscribed they do not distinctly signify anything of the kind; nor are they so explained in the codicil appended to them by the patr. Nectarius, or in his separate letter: see p. 349.

[40] '*Un*trustworthy,' by a contemporary hand in the margin.

But from the official papers of the prikaz of secret service Solovieff gives a different account, to this effect: The tsar after having had the two patriarchs on the 5th Nov. sitting three hours with him alone, on the 7th Nov. made a speech to all the synod about Nicon's departure in 1658; and the bishops presented the depositions taken in 1660, and the extracts then made from the canons. On the 28th Nov. the *tsar* in another session *read through the charges* against Nicon, and *asked the patriarchs* to decide the matter according to the canons and according to their own discretion. *They* replied that it was *necessary* to summon Nicon, and call upon him to answer.[41] p. 416. So a decree was sent, saying: 'The most blessed patriarchs Paisius of *Alexandria* and Macarius of *Antioch* and all the sacred synod call thee to appear personally before *us* respecting certain spiritual matters: be not *disobedient*, but come *in a humble manner*,' &c. There were sent with it an archbishop and two *archimandrites*. Nicon, highly indignant, replied: 'I shall not come voluntarily; but under compulsion of the tsar perhaps I may come.' [Really Nicon said: 'I have my institution from the patriarch of *Constantinople*: but if the patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch are now come with the knowledge and consent of the patriarchs *Parthenius* of C.P. and Nectarius of Jerusalem, "for information about divers spiritual matters," I will come for those matters, and to give information.' p. 412. The synod sent a second citation, saying: 'Thou didst not obey the *ukaz of the tsar* and the *command* of the patriarchs: thou didst refuse disrespectfully; so becoming rebellious against the tsar, and dishonouring the patriarchs and all the synod. And now, overlooking thy *affronts* and *disobedience*, they have sent to thee this second time,' &c. p. 415.] And Nicon, having first been anointed with the εὐχέλαιον, and having celebrated the liturgy, *in which he made mention only*[42] *of Parthenius patriarch of C.P.*, set forth, and [after being met on the road by a third citation] arrived at Moscow; and a lodging was assigned him in the house of the metropolitan Theodosius[43] of Servia, where he remained *under a guard of soldiers*. p. 168.

On the 1st Dec. *we* bishops all met in the *Zolótaia palata*[44] [and he names them all, *omitting*, however, *the two patriarchs*, who sat on *separate seats* on the *left*] and sat on the right; the kniazes and boyars, Niketa Odoefsky, Gregory Cherkasky, Youry Dolgorouky, Iv. Prozorofsky, Peter Soltikoff, Bogdan Khitroff, Herodion Streshneff, and many others, sitting on the left. Nicon was summoned, and came, by no means as a man *under condemnation*, but with a cross borne before him, and with his episcopal staff borne aloft, and giving his blessing to the people. He made the introit as usual; and during his prayer all stood: and having prayed for the tsar &c., and for the four œcumenical patriarchs, and for all

[41] Nicon had *not been summoned* by the synods of 1660 and of the spring of 1666; yet the acts of those synods against him are distinctly recognised as valid, and are confirmed below by the two patriarchs and this synod of Dec. 1666, p. 161, 460, 461, though inconsistently. Comp. p. 495.

[42] See p. 412, 416, 418, 430, 433, 438, 456, 457, 461, 477, 478.

[43] But at p. 415 in the official minute it is 'the podvorie of the church of the Archangel in the Kremlin, at the Nikolski gates.'

[44] The '*Stolóvaia*:' see p. 417 and 440.

orthodox Christians, he bowed to the tsar thrice, and to the patriarchs twice. He was honoured with a word from the autocrat that he should sit. (p. 440). They turned to him with an invitation to sit on the *right* side, *on the same bench with the bishops* (p. 418). But Ligarides writes: A sign was made to him to sit *in the usual place*; but he gravely blamed the tsar, and said: 'Though I am not come hither to be honoured, thou oughtest to have honoured the patriarchal rank as is decent and just.' Then both the patriarchs exclaimed against him [with rhetorical invectives], ending thus: 'and dost *thou* demand a chair! To *sit* is for a *judge*, and not for a man *under condemnation*.' Nicon *was persuaded* by these words, and so remained standing in the midst, and said: 'I am come to learn why *the œcumenical patriarchs* have called for me.'

Then *the tsar* came down from his place, and said: 'The *ex*patriarch Nicon, for his own caprices, *without our order*, and without any synod, renounced the patriarchate, and he has left the Church in widowhood now nine years: ask him *why* he left the chair?' They asked him (through an interpreter; for they themselves knew not the Slavonian tongue. p. 440). He answered: 'Have you the counsel and consent of the patriarchs [Parthenius] of C.P. and [Nectarius] of Jerusalem that *you* are to *judge* me? Unless you have, I will not reply to you: for my appointment is from the patriarch of Constantinople.' They referred him only to the patriarchal tomes and signatures brought to Moscow in 1664 (when *Dionysius*, not Parthenius, was the sitting patriarch of Constantinople); so that they did not attempt to show that they had come with the cognisance of the patriarch *Parthenius*, nor even with that of Nectarius, though *he* no doubt had joined with them three years before in subscribing the tomes. See p. 412, 418, 477. Nicon also challenged two of the Russian bishops present as disqualified to be witnesses or judges against him, viz. Pitirim and Paul, who were his personal enemies.

The patriarchs again asked Nicon why he had renounced the patriarchate? p. 419. [But Ligarides writes thus] *First*, the patriarchs asked him why he left his chair? He replied: 'On account of the wrath of the tsar, which he showed by not causing justice to be done against Bogdan Khitroff when he had struck my servant, and by not coming to the church.' The tsar then, standing in the midst, as if himself under accusation, replied: 'Nicon wrote to me for justice against Khitroff when the tsar of Georgia was at dinner with me: Khitroff struck his man for making a disturbance, and for his want of manners: there could be no transaction of ecclesiastical business on the palace stair &c. (p. 419): and on the festivals I was prevented from going to the church by a pressure of business of state.' And he said to Nicon: 'If it was on account of my wrath that thou didst leave the chair, then why didst thou *never* give *any such reason*, but speak *only*[47] of thine own sins; and of not returning as a dog to his vomit; and didst desire that another should as soon as possible be elected patriarch in thy stead?' (The tsar also called God to witness that he had *no anger* against Nicon. On the contrary he had *ever* honoured him as a father, and had wished to continue to do so *without change*, p. 441. Nicon,

[47] But see Nicon's *Replies*, p. 22, 101, 105, 583.

on the other hand, said that 'the tsar's anger was manifested to heaven and to earth.')

The patriarchs asked: 'Then didst thou *not* abdicate?' Nicon replied: 'I abdicated in a sense of my own; as Martyrius of Antioch, when the people were disobedient and mocked him, refused to remain their pastor: nevertheless, since he did this only verbally, it did not really vacate his chair.' They said again: 'Thou didst renounce, saying, "If I be again patriarch, let me be anathema;" and in putting off the pontifical robes thou didst exclaim, 'Ανάξιος, "I am unworthy!"' Nicon replied: 'That is a story which they trumped up against me: if I had so renounced, I *should not have taken away with me a set of pontifical vestments.*' p. 419.

The tsar said: 'Nicon wrote in his letters to the most holy patriarchs many words of dishonour and reviling; whereas I have never written against him one word of *dishonour* and reviling.'[46] And he commanded that they should read out Nicon's letter, which he had intercepted, to the patriarch Dionysius (it is given in full at p. 381-400). When they read the account of the coming to Voskresensk in 1663 of the prince Odoefsky and Paisius Ligarides as commissioners from the tsar and the council of the boyars and from the synod of the bishops (see p. 391), the tsar said: 'They were sent to *reprimand* him for that he wrote to me with great disrespect, and with a curse put certain letters of mine under the Gospel: he reviled the metropolitan of Gaza, *who has the testimony of his confessor in his favour;* and who has with him his *letters of consecration.*' Nicon said: 'I prayed against him who had wronged me, but I cursed not. The metropolitan of Gaza, according to the canons, ought not to be allowed to officiate, [if it were only] for this, that he has left his see, and has been for a long time past living at Moscow.' The patriarch Macarius, alluding to what Nicon had written[47] (see p. 392), said: 'The metropolitan of Gaza was ordained deacon and priest at Jerusalem; this I know of a certainty [he added, '*not* at Rome:' but *that* he could not 'know of a certainty.']

'From that their lawless synod (the synod of bishops acting under the tsar, with Paisius Ligarides for its president, see p. 396, 397) there ceased to be in Russia union with the holy Eastern Church, and with your blessing, but they took their initiative instead from the Roman Kostel, to suit their own wills.' When this was read from Nicon's letter to the patriarch Dionysius, the patriarchs asked Nicon: 'Whereby has Russia separated herself from the Catholic (Eastern) Church?' 'Hereby,' he replied, 'that Paisius of Gaza translated Pitirim from one metropolitan see to another,

[46] He had '*honoured* him as a father' no doubt in those xxv. Questions which he and Ligarides had sent in 1663 to C.P., and in their suggestion of the Answers to be returned.

[47] It may be noticed that Nicon speaks here only of Ligarides being a Latin heretic, who, if orthodox, would be deposed by the canons for living so long out of his diocese and without canonical letters; and who besides had been deposed and anathematised by the patriarch Nectarius. It does not seem that he connected the horrible imputation mentioned in his letter to Dionysius with the excommunication by Nectarius: it is in fact in the *present* tense: very likely it was not read aloud: and Nicon did not bring it up: it is only from Dositheus' letter of 1669, p. 551, that it appears that the excommunication of Nectarius was really for immorality.

and ordained in his stead another metropolitan, viz. Paul, to the see of Kroutitz; and other bishops in like manner: but he had no competency to do that, seeing that he had been excommunicated and anathematised by the patriarch of Jerusalem. And even though he were not a heretic [nor otherwise excommunicated], he had no right by the canons to be living here for any long time at Moscow (see *Replies* &c. p. 4-6, 594): *I* do not *recognise him* for a metropolitan: he has not *even* [*i.e.* so far as I know, see p. 391] *any letters of consecration:* any mujik at that rate may put on a mandya and call himself a metropolitan. I wrote all that I wrote with reference to *him*, but not to the orthodox Christians' [who know nothing about him]. The enemies of Nicon triumphed. On all sides there arose a cry: 'He has called *us all* heretics, and *not only the metropolitan of Gaza:* there must be a decree made *about this* according to *the canons!*' Nicon turned to the tsar and said: 'If thou hadst only feared God, thou wouldst not have so acted by me.' The tsar made no reply. And when the reading of the letter was finished Nicon said to the tsar: 'God will judge thee. I knew at my election that by the end of six years I should be hated and persecuted.' p. 426.

But Ligarides makes the patriarchs of themselves pass from the discussion of Nicon's abdication to the mention of his letter thus: 'But this point (*i.e.* of the abdication) shall at another time be returned to and more closely inquired into: for the present do thou now thyself answer respecting the slanders patched together against our emperor, and sent with thy subscription to the œcumenical patriarch Dionysius.' Nicon, *not being aware that his letter had been intercepted*, said: 'Let my letters be produced:' and produced they were, being as it were letters of information from him addressed to the patriarch of C.P. Dionysius, *to the patriarch of Jerusalem* Kyr Nectarius, *and to the patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch* now present at Moscow, Kyr Paisius and Kyr Macarius. They were read. In them Nicon accused the emperor . . . of invading ecclesiastical rights and property. p. 173. Also he wrote that all the *synclete* had fallen away to the *doctrines* of the Pope, on account of Paisius metropolitan of Gaza, the papolater, whom he also called repeatedly a great *heretic*. Nevertheless, being desired to *specify* the *heresy* of the metropolitan of Gaza, Nicon *said* that in point of fact he had belched out this *calumnious* information through human passion; that is, because Paisius did not depart from Moscow quite so soon as Nicon wished; but stayed on there without *returning* to his own see,[47] *only*, as *was clear*, to work up the case against him. The patriarchs bade read that section of the Nomocanon of Matt. Blastar which enacts that *the emperor is not to be insulted;* and whoever insults him *without just cause*, if a clerk, is to be deposed. . . The bishops cried out: 'Let Nicon, then, be punished according to the law: for he not only did not *honour* our autocrat, who is *orthodox*, *pious*, and *most munificent*, but we even see with our eyes his libels sent against him to the œcumenical patriarchs, vituperating him, and calling him a heretic, a Jeroboam, and an Uzziah, *cabalting against him*, and exhibiting himself self-condemned. Therefore he is destitute of all excuse, as having disturbed not only

[47] *Or to Moldavia!*

the clergy, but even *the empire, yea and all the synclete:* and he who disturbs the empire is inexcusable, according to canon xii. of Antioch.'

'What then, pray,' asked the synclete, 'is he to suffer who, as a hireling, has not only left his flock untended for nine years, but now also reviles it as heretical to the œcumenical patriarchs?' 'Let the Nomocanon,' said the patriarchs, 'be brought in and read.' And they read out of it from Matt. Blastar the description of the duty and character of a patriarch,[48] beginning, 'A patriarch is a living image of Christ' &c., and ending thus: 'but he ought to be also *capable of rebuking the disobedient*, and *in the cause of truth and justice* of speaking *even before tsars, without being abashed*.' 'Therefore,' the patriarchs said, 'Nicon, who slanders his flock as if all have turned aside towards the Pope of Rome (whom yet he himself *sought very busily* to have for his judge, and by no means us the Eastern patriarchs), is not a true shepherd, but a hireling and a robber. Wherefore he is to be deposed as a slanderer of his own wife (that is, of his flock) as if she were a strumpet.' p. 176.

Nicon was questioned farther why he had anathematised the metropolitan Pitirim (1660) on the Sunday of Orthodoxy? He replied: 'Because he had sat on the ass on Palm Sunday (in 1659), and also because he was *in the habit* of omitting my name from the diptychs (though I was no heretic), and ordained priests and deacons (which a vicar-bishop cannot do) without my knowledge.' After *much disputing* the conclusion was this: that all these things had been done after Nicon's public abdication, and after Pitirim had been *by common consent*[49] elected to be the superintendent and vicar of the patriarchate. p. 176.

On the 3d December in another session (of which neither Ligarides nor the summary account in the patriarchal archives makes any separate mention), before Nicon came in the tsar informed the patriarchs that on the evening before he sent to Nicon meat and drink, but he had refused to receive it, saying that he had sent no message for *that*.[50] 'Nicon does everything as if he were going out of his mind,' replied the patriarchs. p. 427.

When he had come in, the tsar, stepping down from his place, made a speech; and all present petitioned the patriarchs against Nicon thus: 'Inveighing against the metropolitan of Gaza he wrote to the patriarch of C.P. as if all orthodox Christendom had seceded from the Eastern Church *to the Western Kostel*, whereas there has not been any sort of separation. We petition therefore that the patriarchs should clear all the orthodox Christians from such an imputation.' Here the tsar and all the council bowed to the patriarchs to the ground. 'This is a matter of the utmost moment,' replied the patriarchs: 'Nicon then called *us* also

[48] The same as is copied out also in Nicon's *Replies* at p. 61.

[49] That is, simply *the tsar's order*; for it was not till the spring of 1660 that the tsar caused a *synod* to be held on the subject: and this synod having only recently, on the 27th February, after hearing extracts from the canons read, found Nicon to be self-deposed, even from the priesthood, Nicon on the 11th of March anathematised Pitirim, who presided in the synod for and under the tsar.

[50] He had sent a message to ask that the guards should be ordered to let his attendants go out to *buy* necessary food *for themselves*.

heretics, *as if* we were come to judge *among heretics*.[51] But we in the Muscovite empire are orthodox Christians.[52] We will for this [in conjunction with the metropolitan of Gaza] judge the patriarch Nicon, and defend the orthodox Christians *according to the canons*. p. 428.

The tsar now handed to the patriarchs three letters, in which Nicon wrote himself '*ex*patriarch' (*bivshi patriarch*). The patriarchs declared: 'Whoever is convicted of lying thrice is by the laws no longer to be believed: but Nicon has been convicted of *many* lies. Whoever has slandered any one is subjected to the same punishment which he would have brought on the other. He, then, who has brought a charge of heresy against the metropolitan of Gaza and against all orthodox Christendom, and fails to prove it, incurs himself, if a priest deposition, if a layman excommunication.' (The tsar also exhibited Nicon's letter, *i. e.* his written proposals and conditions, for the appointment of a new patriarch.) The patriarchs continued: 'When Timouraz the king of Georgia was at the tsar's banquet-table, Nicon sent his man *to make a disturbance*; but in the laws it is written: "Whoever makes disturbance *between kings* is *worthy of death*:" and as for him who struck Nicon's servant, God forgive him! for *so it ought to be done*.' At these words the patriarch of Antioch arose and *blessed* Khitroff *with the sign of the cross* (see p. 536, 537). p. 429.

On the 5th Dec. there was a third session. Before Nicon came the tsar told the patriarchs that 'Nicon, before coming to Moscow, confessed, and communicated, and caused himself to be anointed [as if for death] with holy oil.' The patriarchs at this were *astonished* not a little. p. 430.

The patriarchs asked Nicon: 'Who gave thee authority to write thyself patriarch of the New Jerusalem?' Nicon replied: 'I did not so style myself.' Here Hilarion archbishop of Riazan showed a letter in which it was written thus exactly. Nicon said: 'That is my handwriting: maybe it was a slip of the pen.' He added: 'I have heard from some Greeks that there are now *other*[53] *patriarchs sitting* in the chairs *of Antioch and Alexandria*.' The patriarchs said: "*We* have not been deposed; nor have *we* renounced our chairs. It may be that the *Turks* have done something in our absence: but if any one has dared to invade our chairs *by compulsion of the sultan*,[54] such an intruder is not a patriarch; he is an adulterer.' Nicon replied: 'From this hour I call God to witness that I will not speak before the patriarchs, so long as the patriarchs of C.P. and Jerusalem are not here.' p. 431 and p. 140.

Ligarides writes of the session of 5th Dec. that Nicon came as before, and again stood. And the patriarch Paisius began: 'Whoever doeth and speaketh falsehood has for his father the devil: truth cannot be hidden: the *tsar* is *strong*; but the *strongest* of all things *is truth*. . . . So the truth will defend and save thee also, O brother Nicon, if only thou

[51] Or to sit as brethren in council, they might have added, with men destitute of canonical letters, deposed and excommunicated even by ourselves, and known to be at least under the imputation of unmentionable crimes.

[52] And as for the metropolitan of Gaza, we receive him as he is received by the tsar, and we have of ourselves specially asked for him of the tsar to be our guide and our instructor in this affair; see p. 156.

[53] So in truth there were; see p. 478, 555, 558. [54] Or of the tsar?

wilt speak the truth.' Kyr Macarius also spoke, and said: '*As* in time past the emperors of the Romans convoked the most sacred synods, *so* the tsar Alexis *has assembled this most religious synod: he* has *laid the whole weight of the Church of the Russians* on our shoulders, saying: "Behold the great controversy of this Church: the Most High shall require it of your souls in the terrible day of judgment: *see then that ye do nothing of partiality* or passion." Say now therefore, and answer, we adjure thee by the Truth itself, O *brother* Nicon, why didst thou abdicate thy chair? God is not mocked: and if thou liest, thou wilt lie not unto men, but directly against the Holy Ghost.' Nicon replied: 'On account of the wrath of the tsar.' The tsar replied: 'It was *not* through any anger or hatred of mine, but only of thine own self-will; for thine own tortuous and multifarious desires *ebbing and flowing oftener than the Euripus, and going through more transformations than the octopod.*' The patriarchs resumed: 'Why then didst thou not say this? but didst *only* declare that thou wert unworthy, and put off thy robes, repeating at the same time, "I am unworthy; I am no more patriarch"?' Nicon [as before in the first session] absolutely denied having done this: wherefore there were sought out *credible witnesses:* and *Pitirim* metropolitan of Novgorod and Joasaph of Tver, and some members of the synclete, especially the boyar Herodion Streshneff (who was sent to desire Nicon to return to the chair) gave their testimony, adding that he refused, and imprecated a curse on himself if he should ever return. Nicon called them all false witnesses, who sought by giving such testimony to serve and please the tsar. This imputation produced a great excitement. 'Yes,' said the synod; 'but if in the mouth of two or three witnesses every word shall be established, it is not possible to say, when *ten thousand* persons of rank and worth witness against thee, that they all lie,' &c. p. 181.

But since, while this was going on, a vast hubbub had arisen, the patriarchs rose and said: 'It is not on this one charge only, my good man, that thou art accused, but there are also *ten thousand other charges* against thee. Come then, let us take another: Why didst *thou alone* of thyself depose Paul bishop of Kolomna without a synod of twelve bishops?' Nicon replied: 'I did not by my own authority deprive him formally or altogether;[55] if I stripped him of his mandya, that was only giving him a warning [*the tsar* did the rest].' The bishops cried out at this: 'Thou *alone didst* deprive *our brother*, without our cognisance.' p. 182.

The patriarchs seeing the strife of words to be endless, said: 'We have not come here *to wrangle with thee*, but to *pronounce* the decision[56] of the most holy patriarchs [already prepared against thee in their Tomes sent in 1664]. And *since thou* in the former meeting *didst desire to learn if we had the authorisation of the other two patriarchs also, see here we* [again] *show thee their signatures written in these two Tomes which were already sent to Moscow previously to our arrival* [*i. e.* in 1664, when Dionysius, not *Parthenius*, was patriarch of C.P.]. The tsar too, according to the minutes of the prikaz of secret service (see p. 433), said to Nicon: 'Dost thou believe the word of the œcumenical patriarchs? *they have subscribed with*

[55] See *Travels of Macarius*, p. 169.

[56] See p. 457, 461.

their own hands that the patriarchs of Antioch and Alexandria have come with their consent[56] *to Moscow.*' Nicon looked at their subscriptions, and said: 'I do not know their hands.' The patriarch of Antioch said: 'These are the genuine subscriptions of the patriarchs.' Nicon replied to the patriarch of Antioch: 'Here thou hast it all thine own way; but how wilt thou answer for thyself to *the patriarch* [*Parthenius*] *of Constantinople?*'

After this the heads of these patriarchal Tomes were read out in Greek and in Russ. And first there was read chap. xiv., in which it is laid down that a bishop *who has once abdicated* and *gone into retirement* cannot afterwards return to his chair; nor he who has put himself down to the place of penitents; and for this there was adduced canon ii. of the council held in the church of St. Sophia: 'Whoever throws up his chair of his own will without any persecution shall be no more allowed to hold it' (p. 431: and at p. 193 and 446): 'A bishop who descends from his chair to the place of penitents cannot do episcopal acts.' Nicon demurred to this canon as spurious; for he recognised only the VII. œcumenical councils and the local synods held before them; but those held subsequently he by no means received.[57] The patriarchs said: '*Probably* then thou rejectest also *this* synod of *ours*, which has been *confirmed* [first] and *held* [afterwards] against thee by the *four* patriarchs?' (But compare Solovieff's account at p. 431.) Nicon answered: 'All these writings' (the tomes, that is, and the extracts from the canons) 'are trash; adducing spurious canons, most vilely misinterpreted and misapplied: Who ever called penitence a *plough?*' At this the synod cried out: 'What then? cannot the four patriarchs interpret the scripture, and apply its texts for edification?' The patriarchs too spoke, and said: 'We all, the four patriarchs, are the successors of the Apostles; and we act and speak in their names,' &c. The patriarch of Alexandria said: 'Knowest thou not that the patriarch of Alexandria is œcumenical judge?' Nicon replied: 'Then judge thyself; and say that in Alexandria and Antioch there are now no patriarchs, because they live in Cairo and Damascus' (p. 184 and 433). Against such contumacy the tsar and the synclete and the synod objected, as showing a most malicious and reprobate spirit.

The patriarchs demanded of him: 'Say, how many bishops canonically judge a bishop, and how many are needed to judge a patriarch?' Nicon replied: 'A bishop is judged by *twelve* bishops, but a patriarch (only) by the whole world' (by the οἰκουμένη). The patriarchs said: 'Thou *alone* didst depose the bishop Paul of Kolomna *uncanonically*.' p. 433.

[56] The same is asserted also in the synodal act at p. 445; but it is clear from the tsar's own letter to the patriarch Parthenius (p. 477), and from those sent by the two patriarchs Paisius and Macarius to the same Parthenius, and to the patriarch of Jerusalem Nectarius (p. 459, 456), that there was no mutual understanding previously, and that they had *never* subscribed *any document* showing that the patriarchs Paisius and Macarius *went with their consent* to Moscow. The subscriptions, therefore, exhibited as equivalent to such a document must have been those of the Tomes of 1663-1664.

[57] So too in the synodal act at p. 446: but this is false; see Nicon's *Replies* &c. p. 622, 623: he disputed only the genuineness of the text quoted, and the application made of it.

Then Kyr Macarius asked Nicon whence he had learned to have the cross carried before him? seeing that this was not customary in time past. Nicon replied: 'The cross is the standard of Christians, which routs all our enemies.' 'Yes,' said the patriarch: 'but if this was not usual even before, how darest thou *now* to lift up this standard, when thou comest *to trial*, and after thine own emphatic and solemn abdication?' The patriarchs gave order to take away from Nicon the cross which was borne before him, on the ground that no single patriarch had any such custom, and that Nicon had taken it *from the Latins*.[58] So it was taken away by the deacon of the patriarch of Alexandria, and held before the two patriarchs; and afterwards it was carried before them, when they went out, as far as to the door of the patriarchate. p. 185.

The patriarch of Alexandria said: 'Though I am the œcumenical judge, I wish to judge *this man here* out of the Nomocanon. Let can. xii. of Antioch be read: *Whoever troubles the emperor, and disturbs his empire, is altogether without defence.*' Nicon objected that the book out of which this was read was printed by the heretics at Venice. The Greek bishops all certified that they received that book as orthodox, and correctly printed. However, for greater security, the Russian Kormchay was produced. But even this itself was objected to by Nicon as inaccurately printed under the late patriarch Joseph. He was forced to confess that some things had been inaccurately printed even during his own patriarchate: wherefore he had commanded the bishops to correct them all with exactness whenever there should be a convenient season.

Afterwards the Roman [*i. e.* the Greek] bishops were asked what punishment was due to Nicon, who had trampled under foot the divine canons &c.; and had accustomed himself to innumerable acts of *rapine and injustice* all the time of his patriarchate. They replied: 'Let him be *canonically* deposed, and stripped of all power to do sacerdotal acts.' 'Ye have spoken well,' said the patriarchs; 'but still let the Russian bishops also be asked.' They all answered: 'Let him be deposed *in the most complete manner*.'

The patriarch of Antioch said: 'It is written: "When *forced, even the devil* confesses the truth;" *but Nicon* does not *i. e.* cannot be forced to) confess the truth.'[59] p. 434. But Ligarides writes, p. 187: 'Sometimes *even the devil* has been found to speak truth: but *Nicon* has *never* at any time *so much as once spoken truth*, and has shown himself *worse than Satan*.'

The patriarch of Alexandria resumed: 'Behold, O Nicon, a time *of penitence* is now opened before thee. Bewail thy many sins, that thou mayest become fit for the kingdom *of God*: for penance *is* in truth *a spiritual plough*.' All cried out in assent: and they added: 'That which must be done, let it be done quickly.'

Then both the patriarchs stood up; and the patriarch of Alexandria, as the judge, delivered sentence: 'It has seemed good to *us* and *to the Holy Ghost*, and *to the divinely-crowned tsar*, and we decide, *according to*

[58] See *Travels of Macarius*, p. 40, 103.

[59] It was made a great point to force criminals to *confess*. So Dr. Collins writes that in Muscovy no criminal can be put to death *till he has confessed himself guilty*.

the decision of the most holy patriarchs our brethren in the Holy Ghost, that Nicon is no more patriarch of Moscow, on account of all the offences lawlessly committed by him, and punishable by the canons' (specifying eight of these as the most important, p. 188); 'on account of which, and lastly and especially on account of his *fantastical ideas*' (respecting the relations of the spiritual and civil authorities), 'we strip him of all episcopal honour and power, and degrade him to be a simple monk.'

It was ordered that this sentence should be written in the Roman (*i.e.* Romaic-Greek) and Russian languages, for a perpetual record. And it was determined that on a set day there should be performed, *in presence of the Church*, the act of deposition. So every one returned to his own lodgings, wondering at the obduracy of Nicon's heart, and at his unrepenting madness.

But first Nicon said aloud: 'Ye have power *now* to say and to do such things, *because ye have received it from the tsar*.' Also, shrugging his shoulders, he said audibly, as he stepped into his sledge, these words:[59] 'Ah, Nicon! thou deservest to suffer what thou sufferest. Thou oughtest not to have been so plain-spoken in uttering truth, but shouldst have dissembled it, and sometimes disguised it with words of economy, suiting thyself to times and occasions.' On the 8th December the patriarchs *sat with the tsar alone three hours*. On the 12th December the patriarchs assembled with the clergy in the krestovaia hall of the patriarchate,[60] and sent to ask the tsar to send to them some one from the synclete. The tsar sent the boyars prince Niketa Ivan. Odoefsky, the prince Ivan Alex. Vorotinsky, and Peter Mich. Soltikoff, the doumni dvorianin Procopius Kouzm. Eleazaroff, and the secretary of the council Almiaz Eleazaroff; also the stoluik prince Peter Sim. Prozorofsky and other stolniks. Nicon was kept waiting in the corridor or vestibule which is before the krestovaia. p. 434.

Presently the patriarchs went forth to a church [or chapel rather] of the Annunciation, which was over the [back] gates of the Choudoff monastery, and stood in their places with all the bishops, vested with their epitrachelia and omophoria, and wearing their mitres. They summoned Nicon: he came, prayed before the icons, bowed to the patriarchs twice to the waist, and stood on the left side of the western doors. And the patriarchs having said the Εὐλογητὸς κ.τ.λ., and having performed the rest of the office, stood at the royal doors, called Nicon up to them, and bade him listen to the reading of the synodal act, which (having been already read in Greek by the priest John, economo of the great church of Antioch) was then read in Slavonic by Hilarion archbishop of Riazan. p. 191, 434, 443.

[59] But compare the account given by Shusherin.

[60] See *Travels of Macarius*, p. 269, 273-276, 321, 165. Separated by a porch from a church of the XII. Apostles: here Nicon had held a synod, and had given banquets: here he was condemned; while judges appointed by the tsar sat in his patriarchal prikazes in the same palace: here, or in a room adjoining, in 1720 was held the assembly for instituting the spiritual 'Kollegium,' since renamed 'the M.H. Directing Synod:' here, 21st Feb. 1721, it first met; and Peter being asked if the patriarchate had been suppressed without a word being said about it, exclaimed, 'I am your patriarch!' and here in A.D. 1763 Arsenius Mac.eyevich metr. of Rostoff was *degraded*

It began thus: 'In the name &c. Amen. Whereas Nicon &c. has *troubled* our emperor &c., and *disturbed all his Orthodox empire*, by (1) *interfering* in matters *not belonging to the patriarchal power and office*, the heads of which our emperor sent and notified to *us* the *four* œcumenical patriarchs, asking if it was proper that any patriarch should so act; and above all inquiring (2) concerning Nicon's extraordinary act of abdication; and (3) concerning his still doing episcopal acts, styling himself *profanely* Patriarch of the New Jerusalem, plundering like a robber, and, having changed his mind, opposing obstacles to the appointment of another patriarch. And on that account our most potent hossoudar the tsar desired the personal presence of the œcumenical patriarchs in Moscow. However, the other two patriarchs were not able to go thither in order to judge, either personally or through exarchs sent to represent them. But, behold, we two patriarchs Paisius &c. and Macarius &c. have come to Moscow, *with the counsel and consent of the other two most holy patriarchs*,[61] in order to examine and judge of the acts of Nicon, and of every other ecclesiastical matter which may need it.

'We, then, have found Nicon guilty, and liable to canonical punishment on many charges, among which are the following: 1. He anathematised Russian bishops without trial or judgment. 2. He caused the Church to be in widowhood eight years and six months, during which vacancy there arose many schismatics and agitators. 3. He nicknamed two bishops Annas and Caiaphas, and two nobles of the synclete Herod and Pilate. 4. When summoned, *according to the custom of the Church*, to answer, he not only did not come in humble guise, as we, out of *brotherly charity*, prescribed, *that so we might obtain for him more indulgence*, but, quite the contrary, he, when he appeared before the council, immediately began (as he had done also before) even *to accuse us*, saying that we were not in our ancient chairs, calling our patriarchal judgment (*i.e.* the Tomes) "*stuff*," our quotations from the canons (especially canon ii. of the council held in St. Sophia) *falsifications*; rejecting all councils held after the Seventh œcumenical council; calling our own interpretations "*utter trash*," and our Eastern Nomocanon *heretical*, because printed in the West. 5. Also *in letters written to us* the *four* œcumenical patriarchs, which *came into the hands* of the most clement tsar, he charged this *our* most orthodox hossoudar with *latinising*, calling him also a persecutor *who was wronging the Church*, and comparing him to Jeroboam and to Uzziah. In like manner he slandered the synclete and all the Russian Church, as turning aside to the Latin doctrines. And this he said chiefly on account of the metropolitan of Gaza Paisius, out of *spite* against him, because he knew him to be habitually in communication with the most illustrious *synclete* concerning *certain (political)*[62] *affairs*. But for this, that he reviles his

by the 'M.H. Synod' for raising his voice against the ukaz of Catherine II. finally confiscating the estates of the monasteries and the bishops. In 1731 Nov. 9th, the 'M.H. Synod' was partially, and in 1742 altogether, transferred to St. Petersburg. For coronations it still comes here.

[61] This is false. See above at p. xl.

[62] The word 'political' is in the Greek of Ligarides (see p. 193), but not in the Slavonic of the synodal archives (p. 446): but both versions alike mention only *his*

flock, he is rightly held and declared to be not a shepherd but a hireling. 6. Farther, he by himself alone deposed a bishop, without any local synod; and, even while living at Voskresensk, he punished many people not with spiritual mildness, but with cruel secular punishments. p. 193, 446.

'Since, then, Nicon did not show *episcopal meekness*, but practised tyranny and injustice, betook himself to *plundering*, and incurred the guilt of *cruelties*, we, *in obedience to the canons*, being vested in our omophoria and epitrachelia, have altogether deposed and degraded him, in conjunction with the local synod of the Russian bishops and with the Greek bishops [of whom Paisius Ligarides is one] present in Moscow, so that he is to be henceforth simply the monk Nicon. And in his room we have all of us [Paisius Ligarides being one of us] with one accord determined to elect another patriarch[a] to the chair, without any delay, against whose legitimacy there can be no ground for cavil. And the place of Nicon's abode *till his death has been appointed* to be in a certain monastery, there in quiet to bewail his sins, with an archimandrite to watch him, that he may not be able to concoct any plots or intrigues; and some honourable dvorianin with a small detachment of soldiers, for his complete custody and safe-keeping, that no letters ['tending to excite disturbances,' p. 448] may be carried to him or from him.

'All these things we have done *canonically, without any respect of persons*, without any prejudice or passion in judgment, fearing that eye of God which cannot be evaded (for God *has* an eye *to search out and to punish*); and fearing that future tribunal which shall recompense the same punishment [to them that have wronged others] we have judged and published a godly and righteous judgment; and, according to the power given *from the Apostles and continued even to us*, we declare Nicon, heretofore patriarch of Moscow, to be stripped of all power to do any episcopal act, and henceforth to be only a common monk. And whosoever shall dare to call him patriarch, he shall incur the penalties of the holy fathers. Read in the year of the creation 7175, A.D. 1666, Dec. 12.' p. 191, 431, 443.

While this act was reading, Nicon at times muttered something, as if he were not willing so much as to listen to it; wherefore also he often murmured his objections, and, denying this or that, reviled in return. However, his contradiction was all in the air; and he only justified his name *Nicon* by his *contentiousness*; and he continued gainsaying to no purpose, pouring out *weak washy nonsense*, like the earthen mugs of *water*-drinkers at a fountain. p. 195.

Then the patriarchs, standing in the middle of that holy chapel, declared his perfect degradation in the usual form.

---

relations with the synclete; whereas Nicon's imputation refers solely to the fact tha the Russian *Church* had been governed with *his blessing* instead of that of the Muscovite and Eastern patriarchs.

[a] Ligarides, who had shrunk from meeting personally the two patriarchs and other Greek bishops, till the tsar overruled his scruples, scarcely expected at this moment that the choice would fall on himself; but after the election of Joasaph II., considering his advanced age and the probability that there would soon be another vacancy, he seems for a short time to have had a hope of it; see p. 548.

[Of this form Ligarides should have had personal experience, when he was himself six years before degraded by the patr. of Jerusalem Nectarius: but perhaps all had not been done in his own case with the full 'usual form.' In 1660, when Nectarius (on the death of Paisius) became patriarch, Ligarides was living in Moldavia, with which the patriarchs of Jerusalem (then residing mostly at Constantinople) were closely connected through the monasteries there belonging to the Holy Places (whether he had *ever* so much as *been* at Gaza, is doubted by Nicon in his *Replies*, p. 97). Nectarius, who was 'such a man for justice, that in his time another Greek bishop like him could scarcely be found' (p. 581), when on his visiting the Principalities, as we may suppose, in 1660 or 1661 he discovered Ligarides, already denounced *to him and to the patriarch of C.P.* as a heretic and loose liver by letters from the metropolitan of Moldavia (see p. 9, 360, and *Replies*, p. 586), to be guilty of sins which his successor Dositheus writing to the tsar in 1669 could not for modesty name (p. 551), he would no doubt summon him to answer for himself: and then, Ligarides perhaps not answering, he pronounced him to be deposed, degraded, and excommunicated; and sent or took the written act of this to be repeated, or published and registered, afterwards by the local synod at Jerusalem, and at Gaza itself. Ligarides having thus lost his employment in Moldavia (which he may have given up of himself), and having to shift his quarters, went away, according to Nicon, to Poland, where he was 'a long time,' with or under the king, and said mass (as a Catholic *priest*) in all the kostels (*Replies*, p. 551, 586)—and this he would not have done while he was 'known only as Orthodox,' (p. 4)—and determined at length to go to Moscow, of his own will (p. 50), uncalled, to relieve *his see* of its debts (p. 427), that is (since he had *no* see at that time) to get money, if possible, for his own personal needs, by offering his services to the boyars. And when he came to Pontivl, he would obtain admittance without difficulty by producing that letter of invitation which had been sent to him 1 Dec. 1657 (in consequence of some words from Arsenius Souchanoff) by the patriarch Nicon (p. 5, 8, 9, 51), though it is likely that he entered also 'in the tsar's name' (see *Travels of Macarius*, p. 70). Having arrived at Moscow, he was received *without canonical letters* (p. 391); and the tsar asked for his blessing (p. 75); and made the Russian clergy and Church take from him the initiative blessing, instead of taking it from Nicon, or seeking it by appeal from the patriarch of Constantinople (p. 368, 392, 396, 424, 173): he obtained for the tsar, the synclete, and the Church a prejudgment of the case against Nicon from the four Eastern patriarchs, the patriarch Nectarius who had degraded and excommunicated him subscribing with the rest (p. 75, 76, 82, 343-349); and then he wrote a letter for the tsar (p. 376-379), in which he made the tsar himself sarcastically twit Nectarius for having first compliantly subscribed, and then, when it was 'quite too late,' having become conscientious about the matter, so as to write a separate letter in a contrary spirit (p. 349-356): he brought for them two of the patriarchs personally to Moscow: and then, to do him justice (though Nectarius was not one, for he vacillated, and eventually did not come, p. 84, 362), thought it was better that he should himself

leave Moscow before their arrival (p. 427). But the tsar, though he knew that he had no credentials (p. 391), and that he was said to have been deposed and anathematised (p. 9, 82), and that he was said also since coming to Moscow to be guilty of unmentionable sins (p. 96, 99-101, 392), nevertheless 'economically hushing up' all these suspicions (p. 101), overruled his scruples, as unnecessary. So, not being allowed to leave Moscow, he complimented the two patriarchs on their arrival (p. 126): and they *of themselves* asked to have him for their special interpreter and instructor (p. 156); and concelebrated and communicated with him at the altar, asking no questions (p. 201, 301, 305, 309); and he sat with them in their synod (p. 169, &c.), treating Nicon as a man already condemned; and they defended him in the same synod against Nicon's imputations (p. 423); and even made it one of the gravest charges against Nicon that he had slandered as *latinising* those who gave the ecclesiastical *initiative* to an ex-student of the Greek college at Rome unaccredited from any Eastern patriarch (p. 173, 193, 425, 446). And now (p. 191), standing in omophorion and epitrachelion, he together with them and with all this *plenary synod* definitively deposes and degrades Nicon—not, however, *also excommunicating* him—'in the usual form,' the patriarchs saying, both of them, that he must be stripped of the insignia of the episcopate, viz. of the pectoral and the mandya.]

But *none dared to take them from him*, from some reverence to the highest rank of the priesthood. At length, therefore, the patriarch of Alexandria, *approaching him gently and quietly*, took off the kamilauchion from the head of Nicon. And Nicon said: '*Take also my mandya, if thou will;* for *now* thou hast the power.' 'Well, we ought indeed to do so,' said the patriarchs; 'but in consideration of the urgent request of our emperor Alexis we allow thee to retain the episcopal mandya until thou be come to the place of thy banishment; for then thou must be finally stripped of it. So they left it on him, and also the pectoral (ἐγκόλπιον), which was set all over with pearls. But Nicon said sarcastically: 'I know that, as ye are poor, ye will be glad to have some pearls; so ye had better take my pectoral.' But the patriarchs answered him: 'Take back and keep this to thine own confounded perdition.' p. 196.

In truth thou *oughtest not*, O Nicon, to have been so free-spoken, nor to have represented *the truth* so plainly, so categorically, to the tsar and to the boyars, *without being at all abashed.* For *if thou hadst behaved more politicly, flattering and humouring them*, thou wouldst not have come at last to such a condemnation. Suffer then now, and be content: else, as Epictetus says, If thou frettest in vain, thou only hurtest thyself; and that which bears thee down bears thee down all the same.

The bishops then were indignant at what had been said to the patriarchs; and smarting under it, they all desired that the pectoral might be taken back immediately. So two *of the boyars* being *sent*, as if from the *patriarchs*, regained it, *stripping it off* from him, and hanging it up in the cathedral *with triumph.* p. 196.

Of the same concluding scene Solovieff, using the minutes of the prikaz of secret service, writes as follows: 'When the counts against him

had been read over to him, the patriarch of Alexandria took off from Nicon's head the klobouk, on which were cherubim embroidered in pearls. They took off from him too the panagia [the ἐγκόλπιον or pectoral; that is the upper one of *two* which he had upon him], and said to him that thenceforth he was not to be called 'patriarch' but simply 'the monk Nicon;' that he was to live in the monastery to which he was to be sent quietly, without insubordination, and pray for the pardon of his sins. 'I know, without your homilies, how to live,' he replied: 'but as for this, that you have taken the klobouk and the panagia from me [I *give* them to you], you may divide the pearls from them between you: they will give you each five or six zolotniks of pearls, and about ten gold pieces. Ye are slaves of the sultan, who go about for alms, in order to be able to pay your tribute to the Turks. Whence have ye taken these laws? Why do ye what ye are doing here in secrecy, like thieves, in this chapel of a monastery, without the presence of the tsar, of the council, and of the people? It was before all the people that they entreated me to undertake the patriarchate. I consented, seeing the tears of the people, and hearing the fearful adjurations of the tsar. I was made patriarch in the cathedral, before all the multitude of the people. And if it be your wish to condemn and to depose me, let us go to that same cathedral *in which I received the pastoral staff;* and if I am proved worthy of deposition, subject me there to what punishment ye please.' They replied that it was *all the same* in what church or chapel the decree of the council was *pronounced*, so long as it was pronounced with the concurrence of the tsar *and of all the bishops.*

They put upon Nicon a common klobouk, taken from a Greek monk; but the episcopal staff and mandya they did not take from him, *for fear of the people*, according to some accounts; in deference to the request of the tsar, according to others.

The place fixed for the banishment of the deposed patriarch was the Therapontoff monastery of Bielo-ozero, whither there were sent with him two black priests, two deacons, one simple monk, and two laymen. As he got into the sledge, Nicon began to say, apostrophising himself: 'O Nicon, whence has all this happened to thee? "Do not speak the truth [or do not insist on *right*], do not lose friendship:" if thou hadst only given some handsome banquets, and hadst supped with them, this would not have befallen thee.'

They carried him away from the Choudoff monastery hidden within an escort of soldiers; but a crowd followed. Behind the sledge there went the archimandrite of the Spassky at Yaroslaff Sergius; and when Nicon began to say anything, he cried out: 'Be silent, Nicon!' Nicon, turning to his former economo, said: 'Say to Sergius that, if he can, he may stop my mouth.' The economo said: 'The most holy patriarch Nicon bids me say to thee that if thou canst thou mayest stop his mouth.' 'How *darest* thou,' cried Sergius, 'to call a simple monk patriarch?' A voice from the crowd exclaimed: 'Why criest thou out so? the name of patriarch was given him from *above*, not from thee, thou proud bully!' Sergius turned to the soldiers, and bade them seize that man: they replied that he was

already seized, and carried off to the *proper place for him*. Nicon passed that night in the *zemski dvor* (the police-court-house).

The next day, 13th Dec., was fixed for his departure: [it was then a most severe frost, and Nicon had not in coming from Voskresensk prepared himself for any long journey]: the tsar sent to Nicon money and a winter cloak for the road; but he did not accept them. The tsar also asked for *his blessing* for himself and for all his family: Nicon did not give his blessing. The *people* began to assemble in the Kremlin. They were *told* that Nicon was to be taken out by the Sretensky; but when the crowd had gone out they carried him away by another road. p. 437.

'And now' (this is put into the mouths of the two patriarchs at another meeting held the next morning—but the voice is the voice of Ligarides) 'the sea has become calm, the sky is clear, &c.: Nicon has been cast out, that worker of countless mischiefs, who lifted up his head so high, to his own destruction; and the peace of God from on high which passeth all understanding has entered into our hearts, which were before cut as it were asunder. Ye have seen his haughtiness, his confidence. He never once said "I erred as a man," but on every point he wrangled and fought; *not coming to conversion, to repentance*, but putting forward sophistries in defence of his sins, scheming with duplicity and dishonesty, boiling with envy and malice against all, &c. &c. In truth, for a man to correct himself is angelic; but it is *directly satanical*, on the other hand, to be incapable of repentance. If *Lucifer*[64] had ever said, "I have sinned; forgive me, O my Creator!" Lucifer would have been no more Lucifer, but prince, as before, of all the heavenly powers.'

Book III. *Creation of a new Patriarch, &c.*

In Book III. Ligarides relates, p. 207, how on the 14th Jan. 1667 all the bishops met for the *subscription* of the Act for the deposition of Nicon (and of the Russian translation of the patr. Tomes of 1664, to which the same Act referred), and there arose some disagreement on account of *certain little expressions* contained in the appeal or reference of the case (that is, in the XXV. Questions referred to the patriarchs in 1664), which were misunderstood, and wrested by Paul metr. of Kroutitz and Hilarion archbishop of Riazan, *who had seemed to be pillars* of this local synod, and by *some others* of the bishops who had joined them: and on account of the same they were unwilling to subscribe, fearing not a little where no fear was; unreasonably wresting the words, and behaving with obstinacy and self-will;[65] which turned greatly to their own hurt. They went away, both

[64] And so it is implied if Nicon had ever said, 'I have sinned; forgive me, O hossoudar, and ye boyars; for the future I will be your obedient servant,' Nicon would have been no longer Nicon, but patriarch of Moscow, as before.

[65] They had been willing for personal reasons to act against Nicon, but still they shrank from an absolute subjection of the Church to the tsar and the boyars, and attempted after Nicon's condemnation to make a stand, as if taking up his principles. But it happened to them as to the seven sons of Sheva the Jew; and when they began, as it were, to exorcise, and to say: 'We adjure you by Jesus, whom Nicon preached,' the evil spirit leaped upon them, and cried, 'Jesus I know, and Nicon I know; but who are *ye*?' and they fled discomfited, and made an abject submission.

of them, without being brought to reason, while *all the rest* had subscribed. And on this account the tsar was much disturbed. And still more were the patriarchs astonished at the disregard shown to their own most exalted entreaty. So the synod separated with some disorder, and with a command that examination should be made of this part of the patriarchal Tomes in their several cells, and a written answer given in by each after two days.

The matter was this: In ch. ii. of the patriarchal Tomes (see p. 320, 322) it was laid down that every man, whether bishop or patriarch, is bound to yield and submit himself to the reigning sovereign in all *political* matters and causes, so that there be *only* one lord and leader, p. 208.

The day appointed came, and the passages collected in favour of the episcopate and likewise the passages in favour of royalty were publicly read. Simeon archbishop of Vologda said that Chrysostom plainly asserts the episcopate to be above royalty. The metropolitan of Gaza replied that the words of Chrysostom show that in *spiritual* matters this is so, which truth is not at all contrary to the patriarchal Tomes, since they lay it down that in *civil* matters the king or emperor (βασιλεὺς) alone is first.

'True,' replied the archbishop; 'but remember that thou also thyself art a bishop, *and so thou oughtest to uphold rather the rights of the bishops than extol rhetorically those of the* [*secular*] *rulers.*' To this the metropolitan of Gaza answered: 'I declare that I am not a creature of the emperor, but one who rightly divides the word of truth.' p. 215. . . . Lastly, after other passages, there was read one from the first epistle of Gregory Dialogus Pope of Rome to Leo the Isaurian, thus: 'Thou knowest, O emperor, that the dogmas of the holy Church are not matters for kings, but for the bishops. . . . . For this the bishops have been set over the churches, *abstaining from public*, that is from *political* matters; and kings in like manner *are to abstain from ecclesiastical matters*, and to keep to those which have been committed to them, that is, to *political*: but the common counsel and consent of christian kings and pious bishops is one power, when matters are managed with peace and charity.' All cried out aloud: 'O excellent distinction! which gives to each, to the priest and to the king alike, his own.' And after another passage from the second epistle of the same Pope to Leo the Iconoclast: 'See again,' said the bishops unanimously, 'Pope Gregory of Rome rebukes the emperor Leo the Isaurian, all but quoting verbally that verse of the Psalm, "I did speak also against kings, and was not ashamed."' 'Yes,' said the two patriarchs; '*when* the emperor or king *is a heretic*, he is rightly rebuked and condemned, as not submitting himself to the Catholic Church. A distinction, therefore, is to be taken in the question respecting kings, and we must separate *absolutely* from the religious and orthodox such as are impious and heretical.' p. 221.

When they met again the next morning, the metropolitan of Gaza explained a passage of St. Epiphanius, where he says that the throne of David and his royal seat remain in the Church of Christ in the priesthood; and among other things he said: 'Give me a *pattern bishop* (describing him), and I will prefer him to any Cesar or Augustus who has

ever reigned on earth. . . . But *if the contrary shall appear in any case—one man will suffice me as an example . . . Nicon, I mean, who now stands as a layman outside the holy rails*, as having been born and promoted *not to bring peace but a sword upon the Church of Christ*—then [it is implied] I shall prefer the emperor to him. But thou, O our divinely established hossoudar, and most faithful champion of the Church, O thou most truly priest and king, follower of Justinian and of Constantine, thou hast now been raised up by Christ our God as a new David, a man after his own heart, to convoke this synod, following that voice which says: "Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I present in the midst of them," &c. And when he had ended, all applauded, especially the two œcumenical patriarchs, who then desired the pattern of the Jewish kingdom to be considered: and there was read from 1 Kings viii.: 'All the elders of Israel came to Samuel to Ramah,' &c. [to the words] 'Go ye every man to his house.' And the metropolitan of Gaza again commented on this history, saying: 'I wish to explain the right of the kingdom or monarchy. In the first place, the king is free from the laws, accountable to no one. Hence he does as he pleases, judging without being judged, as having irresponsible dominion, and being himself living law. Wherefore also he is represented as a god upon earth among men (see Nicon's *Replies*, p. 105, 401), as the Most High has given him the dominion. Hence the same properties as are in God belong also to the king, as once said the Pythagorean Diogenes &c., and that "*he may force women, as many and of whatever condition he will*," &c. p. 227. And he caused to be read the story of St. John Chrysostom's interference to right the widow whose vineyard the empress Eudoxia had taken to herself, the last passage being this: 'The empress rejoined to Epiphanius: "If thy fatherhood attempts to put any difficulty in my way, so as to prevent my banishing John [as now Nicon], I will immediately reopen the heathen temples, and make the people to worship idols again; and I will make the end worse than the beginning."' At this point the metropolitan of Gaza cried out aloud: 'Go now, and *deny if thou canst*, O most reverend synod, *that sovereigns are provoked to wrath, and will not tolerate it*, if they see the heads of the Church *meddling with their imperial matters, seeing that they are scarcely to be withheld from meddling themselves with ecclesiastical matters.*'

The two recusant bishops, fearing greatly, presented a written petition to the two patriarchs about midnight, praying them most humbly to intercede with the autocrat respecting what they had murmured in objection, on a dark paper written not so much with ink as with the venom of asps. They alleged that Chrysostom has said that the priesthood is above the empire; also that it was not proper that bishops should *kiss the hand* of the king or emperor, quoting from Simeon of Thessalonica, who complains bitterly of the encroachments made by the civil power on the Byzantine Church of his own time. He says: 'For this cause it is that our calamities have been multiplied; and while we strive to have dominion over things not to be meddled with, strangers bear rule over us, &c.; and while we think, alas, to make a gain by appropriating to ourselves things

offered to God, we have lost what was really our own, &c. But God grant that some remedy may be applied to this evil, and that the things of Cesar may be secured to Cesar, and the things of God to God; so that upon all that belongs to us there may be the blessing of God, and sacred things may be secured, and secular things may be prospered and increased.' 'And ye in truth' (the two bishops said in their petition to the patriarchs), 'though ye are oppressed by the infidel Hagarenes, shall obtain for your patience and affliction worthy rewards from Christ. But we, thrice-wretched, who are thought *so happy* for living in the bosom and centre of Christendom, *suffer all manner of constraint in our dioceses*, and all manner of other inconveniences. And though, in spite of ourselves, *we put up with and dissemble the greater part of the wrongs which we suffer from the boyars, yet we shrink with trembling at the thought that the evil must go on and become worse, when it shall be determined and made a fixed principle that the State is supreme over the Church.* And though we have no suspicion that we shall be wronged or hurt in this most happy time of the thrice-happy government of our heaven-defended and glorious tsar, our hossoudar, the hossoudar Alexis Michaelovich —Almighty God forbid that we should ever *conceive* such a thought!—we nevertheless *fear for the future:* we would be cautious respecting *possibilities:* lest they who come to bear rule in future times, not perceiving *the true sense* of the patriarchal Tomes, should run into error, attending *merely to the letter*, which often killeth, being allured miserably and drawn aside to destruction. The thought of these abuses of the letter of the literal text, and of *misinterpretations likely* to be made by *inexperienced translators not perfectly skilled in the Greek tongue*, oppresses us. Therefore, as physicians of souls &c., give us some medicine to heal our pains; yea, yea, and we shall be set up, we who at present appear to stumble, and not to walk upright, nor to follow the common sentence of the most reverend synod:' and more to the same purpose.

The metropolitan of Gaza was called in to read the libel. Shaking his head, he cried, 'O truth, thou hast perished from the earth! &c. In truth the Russians are not *worthy* of so great a sovereign. I myself will answer *this most foolish and wicked* writing. I well know that to the *discontented* and *turbulent* I shall seem a mischief-maker, ready to foment scandals &c.: still *I fear the condemnation of him who hid his talent in the earth, inasmuch as the œcumenical patriarch Dionysius appointed me to be the interpreter, the guardian, and the champion of the patriarchal Tomes.*[1] For this cause I enter into this great contest by no means bearing on my tongue the ox (*i.e.* by no means paid *to keep silence*), but reuttering that most sweet word of the philosopher, "I love Socrates, I love Plato; but I *love more truth*, which is the first of all things." There was no need indeed to *answer* this incoherent and most rubbishy effusion: still, since Solomon says, "Answer a fool, lest he fancy at some time that he has spoken well," I will treat the matter from the beginning.'

Then, after discussing again the comparative excellence of priesthood and empire, he says that 'as it was said, "Either Philo platonises or Plato

[1] In the margin, by a contemporary hand, 'Here he plainly lies,' &c. p. 89, 235, 369.

philonises," even so, I swear by the truth, our most excellent emperor Alexis—let flattery go to the ravens, let the adulation of flatterers, *who like ravens pick out the intellectual eyes*, depart—*has shown himself so knowing in the affairs of the Church* (see *Travels of Macarius*, p. 108, 137, 287, 290), that one would think he *had been all his life a bishop*, and had been trained from a child within the sanctuary, like Samuel. And after this are they not *ashamed* to make it a matter of blame that we kiss the *munificent* hand of this most pious monarch? Yes, indeed; yes, indeed; I do both kiss and embrace the hand *which enriches strangers* &c., the hand anointed with the fragrant chrism of gospel grace, sealed with the earnest of the All-holy Spirit, which writes *salutary ukazes*, which *supplies our external and internal wants*, which lavishes what exceeds all necessity or want.

'Evil is in everything, on all sides interwoven with all the virtues. . . We cannot make a separate πονηρόπολις for the bad. We deny not that there are many [*i.e.* among the nobles, from whom, as the two bishops complained, the clergy suffered much already, and feared to suffer worse] who walk not in the steps of Christ or of the apostles: but still to conclude from *some* to *all* is unphilosophical. Nor if *two or three of the boyars are irreligious*, and insult what belongs to the episcopate, are *all* of them therefore at once to be set down as insubordinate and transgressors. Let us not listen to such a calumny.

'As for those malignants who say that the tsar *creates* the patriarch, they say *what is not true*. It is *by no means* the emperor, but the synod' [with me the metropolitan of Gaza, perhaps, at its head], 'which acts; the emperor *only ministering* in it, being orthodox and religious, as has been shown &c. p. 236-238. As for Simeon of Thessalonica, if he is not always to be rejected, neither is he in all his interpretations to be followed. The bishop by standing on the eagle and reciting the Creed, before his consecration, really tells us that he will be constant and a *lover of Rome* in *the faith of the emperor*, and also disposed to follow the sovereign *in all things*, as a good and obedient subject. This imperial eagle, then, is *his support*, &c.

'Ye "fear *for the future*;" lest, that is, *some future sovereign, having a strong will of his own*, being at once his own absolute judge and legislator (his own measure of justice and law), *enslave the Russian Church*. There is *no chance* of this. This will *never* be. This *will never be!* From a *good* emperor [Alexis] that son [Peter the Great] who shall succeed him will be *still better*. The bad raven lays a bad egg; but from the noble eagle noble will be also the eaglet. He shall not slay the priests like Saul, nor thrust them out as Solomon thrust out Abiathar; but he shall be another Alexis' (alluding to the tsarevich then the heir-apparent), '*i.e.* a helper and defender; having *the plenitude of sovereignty* according to an everlasting race, *despotic* both by right of blood and by the laws. *He* shall be, however, *priest and king*, having *a mixed origin*' (alluding to the ancestor of the Romanoff dynasty, the patriarch Philaret Niketich) '*like Aristobulus*, who was at once high-priest and king: as also Christ the Messiah after the flesh is traced from a *mixed descent*. He shall be a new

Constantine, *emperor at once and bishop*, as we say of him to his praise in the great vespers: and the same is witnessed by the historian Eusebius to have been such a priest and king. . For the emperors of the Romans, like the kings of Egypt, held conjoined the power of the priesthood and the sovereignty; as Virgil sings: "Rex Anius, rex idem hominum Phœbique sacerdos." But I have lengthened involuntarily my *secret* discourse, *which I could wish spoken in the ears of all*.' p. 241.

When it was day all met: and the [Greek] bishops, being asked by the patriarchs if they had anything to bring forward, replied that in time past the four patriarchs had well and wisely made this distinction, that in *political* matters the king or emperor had the prœminence: and they traced this distinction, as to its first cause and occasion, to a constitution in the Nomocanon made in the reign of Constantine Porphyrogenitus by the patriarch of C.P. Alexius and his synod against traitors. It ran thus: 'To them that shall attempt to make any plot or civil confusion, Anathema!' &c. And in like manner in the reign of Manuel Comnenus; and in that of Alexius Palæologus. On this subject also the metropolitan of Gaza spoke, beginning from a law of Julius Cæsar which defines who is properly a traitor and a rebel, viz. he who organises or joins a faction against the emperor, or plots against him, *or against the senate* [as Nicon *plotted* against *the tsar's synclete*] &c. p. 242-245. The *Russian* bishops said: 'We know that heretics are anathematised, as on the first Sunday in Lent; but as for plotters and rebels, that they also should be anathematised we have never yet known; nor have we read of such a thing.' The metropolitan of Gaza asked: 'Have ye not just now heard how traitors were anathematised by the patriarch Michael of C.P. with his synod?' 'Yes,' they replied; 'but whether this can be done *rightly* according to the laws of the Church we are altogether unaware, and would desire to hear proof.' 'Well, then,' said the metropolitan of Gaza, 'does not St. Paul say, "If any man love not the Lord Jesus Christ, let him be anathema maranatha"? But whoever loves not the emperor loves not either the Lord Jesus Christ. And St. Peter speaks thus: "Fear God, honour the king." Behold, behold; after the heavenly God he subjoins *the earthly*' (see *Replies* of Nicon, p. 105, 401) &c. &c. p. 246. And at last he winds up with these words: 'What do ye say, O ye patriarchs? that ye are persuaded by what I have said, or that ye desire farther testimonies?' All answered unanimously: 'What has been already said is *even more than enough*.' 'Therefore,' said their beatitudes, 'let this be the conclusion: that the king or emperor has the prœminence in *political* matters, and the patriarch in *ecclesiastical*; that so the harmony of the ecclesiastical constitution may be the better preserved in its integrity, and uninfringed upon, and may so abide for ever and ever.' All applauded, and exclaimed aloud: 'This is the judgment of us all. Long life to our victorious and invincible emperor! Many years and health to you also, O most holy patriarchs!' p. 251.

The two bishops *repented, though too late*, and *subscribed separately* the condemnation of Nicon *with every jot and tittle of the patriarchal Tomes*. But no one gave them any thanks for their '*Peccavi*,' which was not

honest and religious, but of time serving and men-pleasing, to cloak their own inward retention of their *sophistical ideas*. For all that [though they had subscribed] they were summoned, and put to shame publicly.

Therefore, on the 24th Jan. 1667, *we* all met in the apartments of the patriarch Kyr Paisius of Alexandria (on account of his having hurt his leg) to consider three questions: 1. How is he to be punished who has been contumacious towards a patriarchal synod, and that a great and *plenary* one? 2. If any one show disrespect to the two patriarchs, even to their faces, not obeying nor following them, though they have seen them subscribing in the presence of all? 3. Of him who in the most distinct and practical way shall be *disobedient*, and *refuse to trust* a most christian emperor, who owns the Church to be his *mother*, and is zealous to glorify her as *superior to all supremacy*, and *beyond the sphere of all* [secular] *power*;—how is such an one to be punished, and with what *canonical* punishment? We all answered synodically, that such persons are to be corrected by ecclesiastical penalties; because the decision of the patriarchs *can no longer be called in question*, nor proposed afresh for examination. And especially, if all the four be consentient, they supersede any other judgment, no other higher tribunal existing on earth. p. 251.

The patriarchs then sent for the two refractory and guilty bishops, who soon came running up, as if to kiss the hand of the patriarchs in the usual way: but they were at once *forbidden*. They were *all* then (the other bishops being seated in order) asked, 'Why they, *who seemed to be pillars*, and *of more understanding than the rest*, and at the same time *of more practical ability and energy*, had shown themselves thus *disobedient*, and thus *obstinate?*' They began to excuse themselves, *excusantes excusationes in peccatis*, and uttered nonsense which helped them nothing. Among other things, they said that they had been deceived *by the inaccurate translation of Paisius of Gaza* (see p. 320, 322), who had rendered incorrectly that passage in the Tomes in which it is laid down that the patriarch is *subject* to the emperor in *political* matters *only*, answering herein ignorantly. For the metropolitan of Gaza is not an imperial translator, but of his own voluntary zeal translates and interprets: and he translates not directly but intermediately, *through the Latin tongue*, from the Greek. Wherefore also *he* has [*perhaps*] made no fault in translating *if* the Russian translators [of *his* Latin version] *have* in places failed to reproduce accurately what was being translated. For *such* interpreters generally *leave out* here and there *words which are of importance* (*i.e.* here the word '*political*'), as not knowing how to render expressions which have not their exact equivalents.[65] Wherefore also *they* are not true channels for conveying and communicating the sense, *but rather betrayers and damagers of it*. They also demurred as to some of the expressions in the Profession and Oath of Allegiance given in by the patriarch Michael to the emperor

[65] There was no such difficulty whatever in the word '*politicas*;' and what stands even now (*now* that it is *not* simply '*omitted*') in the printed Slavonic for it, '*po razoumou i blagodostoini reshchi*,' cannot possibly have been a mistranslation from the single word 'politicas,' but rather it was translated from 'secundum rationem et res *condecentes*.'

Manuel (see p. 321, 322), as monstrous, very grovelling, and unbecoming for the patriarchal authority and eminence, and as to the extension of the same to the empress, to their imperial children, and even to the princesses and to their future husbands: and that a patriarch should farther *swear* to all this. p. 254.

But after some explanation concerning oaths, the patriarch of Antioch said: 'A great thing in truth is *obedience* to superiors: *obedience* is *better than sacrifice*. . . . But ye have been disobedient to us the patriarchs who have been *put forward* to come hither *on behalf of all the four, for your honour and correction*. Ye have withstood us, contending against us. In truth *opposition* [to the tsar and the boyars] is *diabolical*; self-will and presumption is *satanical*. Ye have chosen rather to think yourselves wise, than to bow your heads to all the synod, and to submit—*not to men*, but *to the most high God*; and that only for *simple vanity, and for a mere personal partiality*.' The patriarch of Alexandria took it up, and said: 'To make a faction or party is a great crime, forbidden by the civil laws, and much more within the Church: clerks or monks guilty of this are by the canons to be altogether degraded. Ye know, my friends, that ye are *resisting not us but God, resisting the Holy Ghost* (for it hath seemed good to *us* the œcumenical patriarchs, and so also to *the Holy Ghost, to depose Nicon*, who had misbehaved himself as patriarch), thereby breaking the bond of charity, hunting after words and *little niceties of expression, &c.* . . . But to *withhold trust* from a most christian emperor is a proof of pusillanimity, a sign of disrespect, not to say also an exhibition of *ignorance*. For *our* potent emperor both is, and is named, *holy*. . . . Cease then from talking vain nonsense; and *bow your heads to this sacred synod*, that ye may not hear that voice of reprobation, "Depart from me, all ye *workers of iniquity*;" and that word of loathing, "Get thee behind me, Satan!" which ye certainly will hear, if ye persist in setting at naught the patriarchal decision, and calumniate it as inconsistent and interpolated. For they truly *niconise*, or rather *papisticise*, who *try to lessen the empire, and are zealous to extol on high the episcopate*.'

Meanwhile the two bishops stood hanging down their heads and looking upon the ground, as being put to shame. And after a long space of deep silence, the patriarchs said: 'Go, and remain for a time suspended from the performance of divine offices.' And so, *not without tears*, they went out. But the others who were left were struck with fear at their unlooked-for punishment: and then they learned, *both they and others*, that they *now* had *heads and superiors over them*, to rule them; whereas *they had long been used to imagine that they were altogether their own masters*, and had nobody over them, through the *base* absence of Nicon, and the disorder and anarchy which were its consequences. p. 256. And now Kyr Theodosius bishop of Archangel was appointed to be for a short time [instead of Paul who was suspended] guardian of the patriarchate.

After this Ligarides takes part in the election of a new patriarch of Moscow, Joasaph (no *lots* being used, nor any *translation* from one see to another being made, and *re-ordination* being entirely condemned). Joasaph, who was at the time archimandrite of the Troitsa, sought to de-

cline the appointment on the score of his age, but was over-ruled: and in fact his advanced age, which is called by Ligarides 'convenient' (perhaps with respect to his own views on the patriarchate; see p. 548), may have been considered just then a recommendation, as an additional security for his '*meekness*,' Nicon having gone, like another *Judas* [or like Chrysostom], *to his own place of condemnation*. p. 261, 267.

The tsar, in a speech made to induce Kyr Joasaph to accept the chair, is represented by Ligarides at p. 268 as saying, in language too much like his own: 'We swear by truth, the sovereign of all things, that no one personal foe, however noble, nor enemy, has ever *troubled* me so much, so much *exasperated* or *alarmed* me, as he who was heretofore patriarch, Kyr Nicon; who in truth appeared as *a new plague of Egypt*; who undertook and carried on pertinaciously a contest neither *praiseworthy* nor *admirable*, ungratefully heedless of all the good which had been shown him—from *heaven*—most bounteously and abundantly. Wherefore also *the Most High* has recompensed to him, even in this present life, retribution for his *corrupt* actions, using an exact balance: I speak thus not as triumphing, but with pain for him: and for his unchanging obstinacy I deeply grieve; as I see him abiding *inseparable from evil*, giving no opening for any glimpse of hope of repentance or of regret, or of *that improvement which I love*. . . . And God of his compassion brought hither to us the two patriarchs Kyr Paisius and Kyr Macarius, who, finding our Nicon convicted by many proofs, and bound on many charges, *would have corrected him and guided him spiritually*, and would have *calmed his soul*, and *better informed his mind* by *gentle strains*, if perchance it had been possible by *their* pastoral *rod* to bring him to *straightforwardness* and *rectitude*. But we have now *missed our* right and peaceful *aim*: for the jackdaw remained a jackdaw still: the dropsical patient *refused to receive* the medicine of *the needful treatment*, the draughts of the proper purge,' &c. &c. p. 270.

On the Sunday of the Prodigal, the 3d February 1667, the suspended bishops were admonished by the two patriarchs, and pardoned. And so all was gladness. And as Thomas's incredulity was in a sense good, as confirming many souls to believe, so if these bishops, the most *eminent of their brethren*, had not disputed about the sense of the patriarchal Tomes, *the rest would not have been confirmed*: but the sight of the contentiousness of these two bishops coming to nothing, and *ending in sardonic laughter*, produced its effect. It remained still that they should also kiss the hand of the tsar, and *so* receive *perfect* forgiveness of their offences (for they had greatly *wounded him*, the complete king, by their *injurious susceptibility* and *disobedience*). So the next day the tsar came to the patriarchs, to take their blessing: and these two bishops were called with the rest: and having been rebuked before all, and reproached with words which went deep, for their *schism*, they departed in peace, having repeated over and over again '*Peccavimus!*'

There was some whispering, however, still among their friends, *even after this*, in support of them that had said that the empire is exceeded in dignity by the priesthood, because the bishop is named *first in the church*,

and afterwards the emperor: and they quoted Simeon of Thessalonica. But this argument would prove too much, as it would go to set every clerk before the emperor. p. 274. And he compares the chrism of the empire and that of the episcopate; and says that the first, *if not above*, is at least *of equal weight* and *equivalent*, and, to speak aristotelically, parallel and corresponding (ἀντίστροφον) to that of the episcopate. p. 275.

On the Sunday of the Carnival, 10th Feb., the new patriarch was ordained, *Ligarides joining in the imposition of hands*, p. 281. And afterwards he too, in his speech to return thanks to the tsar and the two patriarchs, thanked these latter for all their toils and travels undertaken *solely for the well-being and right pilotage of the Church of Christ*. And the patriarchs replied *most rhetorically*. The prince Niketa Odoefsky, in the name of all the synclete, wished the tsar and the new patriarch many years.

Afterwards Ligarides took a prominent part in dealing with various ecclesiastical questions in subsequent meetings of the patriarchal council, and subscribed all its acts. By one of these it was enacted that the tsar should on suitable occasions raise the rank of episcopal sees, or create new ones: and in relating this, at p. 298, Ligarides quotes a passage from Demetrius Chomatenus thus:

'For the emperor is *director even over the synodical judgments*, and giving them their [legal] force, regulates the ecclesiastical ranks, and legislates for the life and polity of the clergy; yea and for the causes of bishops and clerks; and also for the votes (the elections) of vacant churches; and he advances sees and persons from a less honour to a greater, &c.; and, to speak briefly, *with the single exception of officiating in sacred things, all the other episcopal privileges are clearly represented by the emperor; and in respect of them he acts lawfully and canonically*.' p. 298.

In Holy Week there was a concoction and blessing of the holy Chrism; a ceremony belonging only to the patriarchs, so that Ligarides could not take part *directly* in *that;* but indirectly he *did*, since he had had a share in consecrating one of the three patriarchs who now on Holy Thursday blessed the new Chrism; and, together with the other bishops, he was present and concelebrated in the liturgy (the tsar also then communicating within the altar): and again in like manner he concelebrated on Holy Saturday, and on Easter Sunday. p. 303-311.

From the Supplements.

As regards the personal condemnation of Nicon, though the two Greek patriarchs, with the mixed synod held by them in conjunction with the tsar and his synclete, had treated Nicon from the first as a patriarch, and as already validly condemned both by the local synod of 1660 and by the patriarchal Tomes of 1663 (p. 169, 444-461), still, no sooner had they confirmed and re-inforced the previously-existing condemnation, than they themselves inconsistently allowed that it was in itself invalid; and in dealing with the case of those whom Nicon had between the 10th July 1658 and the 1st Dec. 1666 ordained at Voskresensk, they recognised them as validly ordained, for this reason, that Nicon when he ordained them had *not* as yet been *validly deposed*. p. 495.

As regards one of those two great struggles which Nicon undertook, viz. that against the spirit of popular ignorance and superstition, the patriarchs and the synod which deposed him justified him altogether, acknowledging his zeal for orthodoxy; and in eleven separate acts or tomes, composed during the first six months of 1667 they approved and reënacted (with one unimportant exception; see p. 195) his correction of the church-books, and his other reforms: so that in the eyes of the raskolniks the whole hierarchy and the tsar and the synclete acted as 'disciples of Nicon,' who was said to have been a blind follower of the modern Greeks, corrupted by Turkish and Latin influences, and even himself an introducer of Latin heresies.

As regards Nicon's other great struggle, undertaken against the spirit of secular supremacy, it appears that there was a combination against him of three distinct forces: 1. That of the tsar, who, after his successful campaigns, 'was lifted up' (p. 384, 583), and became personally jealous of the patriarch (see p. 419; and *Travels of Macarius*, Appendix VII. p. 485-491), and was irascible (p. 171), and capable, when thwarted or rebuked, of exclaiming '*Mujik bladin!*' (*Replies* &c. p. 583; *Travels of Macarius*, p. 286, 316); and who had besides a taste for interfering and giving directions in ecclesiastical matters (ib. p. 108, 137, 287, 148, 290). 2. The boyars and other nobles, who represented simply the world and the flesh (p. 534, 537; *Travels of Macarius*, p. 68, and Appendix I. p. 395 &c. 407, and VI. p. 481); who claimed for their order complete superiority over that of the clergy (p. 231); and accused Nicon of troubling the tsar and the empire by *innovating*, contrary to former precedents (p. 74, 75, 321, 352), opposing the Code, which had become *law* (p. 324), exacting from the tsar a *promise* to follow in preference the laws of God and of the Church, and so introducing a dualism of authorities (p. 325). 3. The heads of the clergy, who for personal reasons sided with the boyars and the tsar against Nicon, and had no objection to see the tsar, who was pious and munificent, act personally, if it so pleased him, as lay bishop (p. 231), but yet had no desire to see their order entirely subjected to the *boyars*, and to the lay courts (p. 207, 231, 273).

As regards the tsar and the boyars, it appears that the synclete took the initiative in the proceedings against Nicon rather than the tsar, and went to greater lengths of hostility (see p. 49, 74, 86, 374, 377, 191, 193, 351, 364, 368, 436, 446), so as even sometimes to make the tsar show plainly his own weakness and their predominance. Thus the very first of the XXV. Questions 'embodying the demands or presumptions of Nicon' which were sent in 1663 to C.P., is directed rather against the tsar's own past conduct than against Nicon; and it invites an answer which in plain language would be this: 'The tsar, when he gave unusual honour and power to the patriarch Nicon, was wronging and dishonouring the nobility, and acting contrary to the duty and office of a king or emperor' (p. 319). And the like in Questions iii. iv. x. xi. xii. xiii. (p. 323, 324, 331, 333, 334, 335). And again, in dealing with Nicon's foundations, to which the tsar had been a party, and especially with that of the New Jerusalem, which the tsar had urged him to undertake, with the promise of his own assist-

ance, the boyars made the patriarchs and the synod to condemn these altogether, as unlawfully and uncanonically founded and endowed; *excusing* the tsar for having done wrong of his ignorance, when Nicon ought to have instructed him better, giving him *absolution* for his fault, annulling his grants and letters of privilege, and encouraging him to subject himself to his own imprecations written in them (p. 334, 335, 505, 507); all which was plainly humiliating for him, and by no means what his own personal feelings would have suggested. And in fact, after a few years (in A.D. 1669), the rights and properties of those monasteries were by him restored to them, and their legal status was recognised.

As regards the order of the clergy, no sooner had Nicon been personally condemned and removed (which, but for their deserting him and acting against him, could not have been done), but those same bishops who had been foremost against him, 'who had seemed to be pillars in the synod, and of more ability, understanding, and energy than the rest,' attempted to make a stand *upon his principles* (p. 256), claiming some recognition of the rights of their order, so that it might not be entirely subjected to the boyars and to the civil authority (p. 207, 230). But fearing the consequences of their own audacity, and 'repenting when it was too late,' they first subscribed separately 'every jot and tittle of the patriarchal Tomes' (p. 251), even as falsified and exaggerated by Ligarides (p. 320, 252), and then were rebuked and put to penance all the same for their rebellion and *schism*; so that their attempt ended only *in sardonic laughter* on the part of the boyars (p. 273).

As regards Ligarides, what Nicon objected against the tsar, and the synclete, and the bishops, that they had put the Russian Church and empire under the blessing and initiative (p. 392, 396, 424, 446) of an excommunicated heretic, a vagabond Greek, who had been educated at Rome, this is fully justified by what he relates in his History (p. 74, 77, 89, 102, 156 &c.), and by the public documents written or suggested by him (p. 372, 317), and by the acknowledgment of the tsar himself, who, writing in the first half of 1669 to the patriarch Nectarius of Jerusalem, says expressly that 'he, Ligarides, had brought his empire to a good end of its difficulties, as being extremely intelligent and learned' (p. 551).

And though he had shrunk from meeting the Eastern patriarchs and bishops, and claiming to sit in their mixed synod as metropolitan of Gaza (p. 427), still, when his scruples had been overruled, and under the protection of the tsar and the synclete he had been treated as a brother by the Eastern patriarchs and bishops, being asked for by themselves to be their special instructor (p. 156), and had sat with them in the synod (p. 169), joining in the condemnation of Nicon (p. 191, 197), and in the election (p. 257, 266) and consecration (p. 279) of a new patriarch, and had concelebrated and communicated with them at the altar (p. 201, 281, 300, 305, 309), and had taken a leading part in all the proceedings of the synod as continued in 1667 (p. 255, 281, 288, 295), subscribing all its acts (p. 481-518), he no doubt thought that all danger for himself was now over, and that he was firmly established at Moscow: and so, about Easter in 1667, at p. 101 of his History (then written 'in a very short space of

time') he asserted, not without some grounds, that all the *three* patriarchs (those, that is, of Alexandria and Antioch, and Joasaph the new patriarch of Moscow) had finally declared his entire acquittal of all the calumnies which Nicon had collected and uttered or repeated against him. And now it was, after Easter 1667, that in his account of the commission sent in 1663 to Voskresensk he wrote of himself (p. 79), that he then, 18th July 1663, whispered into the ear of Nicon a suspicion of unmentionable impurity, so that Nicon might seem to the reader to have been prompted by a spirit of revenge and retaliation to invent or repeat afterwards (p. 96, 392) those 'calumnies' against Ligarides at the bare reading of which the tsar was horror-struck (p. 99-101).

He would not indeed put himself forward (comp. p. 427), nor would he expect to be put forward by others, as a candidate for *the patriarchate of Moscow* while the Eastern patriarchs and other Greek bishops were present there: but when he saw that all those selected as eligible, and especially Joasaph who was preferred to the rest, were quite old men—men 'conveniently old' (p. 261, 267, 270)—he may have formed, and we are told by himself (see p. 548) that he did form, an expectation that in the event of another vacancy—likely to occur before long—he might be elected. And so late as July 1668 the Papal nuncio in Poland understood him to be 'ever more and more highly regarded in Muscovy.' The tsar, however, had learned more about him from the mission of Sabbas in 1666 (p. 91, 359-363), or from other sources, than Ligarides perhaps was aware of, or than Solovieff even now has thought proper to divulge.

In the mean time, while the two patriarchs had to stay on at Moscow (p. 478), the tsar wrote to the patriarch of C.P., Parthenius, to restore them to their sees (p. 476), not knowing perhaps that Parthenius had himself taken part in displacing one at least of them (p. 558). The tsar engaged him also, though not by the same letter, to do the like for Ligarides. This was probably done at the instance of Ligarides himself, who thought it might be a disadvantage to him at Moscow to remain destitute of proof that he was in actual possession of any quality: it implies, however, that he now owned to the tsar that he *had* been *deprived*—he might say only for absenting himself from his see (p. 10): and so far he was on a level with the two patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch, who had also been deprived of their sees for *absenting themselves*: so that it might seem to be a good opportunity for obtaining, together with them, his restoration. It does not seem that Parthenius did anything *for the two patriarchs Paisius and Macarius*—perhaps he had not time, owing to the distance of Cairo and Damascus—for they were restored through his successor Methodius (p. 558); but he did make some move (the patriarch of Jerusalem being close at hand at C.P.) in favour of Ligarides, yet not apparently with success, nor without exciting some resentment on the part of the patriarch Nectarius and his successor Dositheus, who describes such interference as altogether irregular, and as only showing the ignorance and incapacity of Parthenius.

But, Parthenius being about that time displaced to make way for

Methodius, after Methodius (in 1667-1668) had become patriarch of C.P., but before Dositheus (1668-1669) had become patriarch of Jerusalem, the patriarch of Jerusalem Nectarius, having had his attention drawn to a *History of the Patriarchs of Jerusalem* written by Ligarides quite in a Latin sense, and having invited the concurrence of the patriarch of C.P. Methodius, these two patriarchs jointly anathematised both that work itself and its author (p. 6). And Nectarius wrote at this same time, in the spring of 1668, a letter to the tsar, making known to him, as it would seem, what had just been done; a letter by which, as Ligarides in Sept. 1668 wrote to the Polish Dominican Schieretsky, he 'spread an evil report against him (p. 517) as being an absolute *papulator*, and in receipt of a pension of 200 ducats from the Propaganda: and in consequence he was then in a very painful and doubtful position: and the patriarch Joasaph was doing his utmost, by fair means and foul, to get him excluded altogether from the assemblies of the clergy; and so to cut off the *whole thread of his hope*, viz. the prospect of being hereafter raised to the patriarchate.' He prays the Dominican father therefore, and through him the nuncio, to use his influence 'that the Propaganda may decree in his favour whatever the Holy Ghost shall inspire;' that is, may give him for his zeal and his 'good intentions and affections' such a pension as he was falsely reported to have (p. 518). Nectarius at this same time had written in his letter to the tsar 'to *detain* him, lest he should go off to the Roman Pope' (p. 552). Soon after this—perhaps that he might be out of the way, and cause less embarrassment while his status was disputed—he was sent with a pension from the tsar to Kieff, where he was invited to give lectures as a professor of philosophy; and he passed there (not to the satisfaction of the voivode) perhaps something less than a year.

The tsar in the mean time, in the spring of 1669, wrote fresh letters in his favour both to Nectarius, whom he supposed to be still patriarch of Jerusalem, but who had now in truth resigned, and had been succeeded by his former archdeacon Dositheus (a Sciote, like Ligarides), and also to the patriarch of C.P., Methodius. He wrote probably with special reference to the anathema recently published at C.P. against Ligarides' History of the Patriarchs of Jerusalem; a work written many years before, never printed, nor even completed, and now dragged to light chiefly perhaps with the view of striking an oblique blow at the man who had so cleverly and so completely compromised all the four Eastern patriarchs, and who through the tsar himself had taunted with cutting raillery his own patriarch Nectarius by whom he had been first excommunicated. But to the tsar Ligarides might represent that, even if he *had*, many years ago, latinised in a writing never published, he had repented of that long since, and had sufficiently re-established his character for orthodoxy: and if, before the recent condemnation of this writing, he had been deprived of his see *for absenting himself*, still his absence had been useful to the Russian empire; and for the last six years he had been kept on at Moscow by the tsar and the synclete. So the tsar in his letter to Nectarius received by Dositheus at C.P. in July 1669, after observing that 'the spiritual art is like medicine, at one time excommunicating for sin, and at another reconciling *for*

repentance,' begged him to absolve Ligarides, since '*he* had brought his empire to a good end;' (that is, had brought it out of its difficulties), 'as being extremely intelligent and learned' (p. 551).

But Dositheus, 1 Feb. 1670, wrote of the tsar's other letter, sent by the same bearer to the patriarch of C.P., that it had been received, but that the patriarch of C.P. could not make any move in the matter; only, if he attempted it, he might bring upon himself excommunication: and though the late patriarch Parthenius (who also had deposed the patriarch of Alexandria Paisius, and put another named Joachim into his place) had attempted at the tsar's request (made in a former letter) to interfere in behalf of Ligarides, he had done that as a man ignorant and unlearned. But as regarded Ligarides, and the letter addressed to the patriarch of Jerusalem on his behalf, Dositheus wrote that he was originally deposed, degraded, and excommunicated by the late patriarch of Jerusalem Nectarius (a man beyond compare for justice) not merely for having absented himself from his see, nor for his Latin heresy, but for crimes of unmentionable impurity: that he, Dositheus, however had, in consequence of the tsar's request, written to his father the expatriarch Nectarius, proposing that he and the local synod should pardon Ligarides, and restore him to the see of Gaza: but Nectarius wrote back that 'we should rather entreat thy majesty to *send him away* from Moscow' [than seek to get him *received* at Gaza].

'But as for that matter,' he writes, 'let it be as thou pleasest: if he is *wanted*, we are glad that he should be useful to thy majesty: but if thou *wishest* to send him to us, we will receive him, and supply him with the means of living *in retirement*, either at Gaza, or, if he pleases, at Jerusalem or at Scio.

'As for *repentance* in order to absolution, *that* he had no mind to: but he writes to certain friends of his, heretics such as he is himself, seeking to frighten us.' And one of these his letters Dositheus encloses to the tsar as a specimen, that he may read it through, and see how he attacks and reviles his patriarch. 'And for that alone he ought to be degraded. And if thy majesty, who, being both righteous and powerful, *might* have *commanded* us to pardon him, yet does *not* command, but only *requests* this, much more certainly ought *he* to have written to us in terms of *petition* and entreaty: but he writes and abuses us, calling us "spiritually dead" and "irreligious;" and our father the patriarch Nectarius he calls "depravity," a "sort of wild beast," an "idiot," and a "madman," with many other unbecoming words, for which I could have wished yet once more to give him the punishment he deserves, were it only for the honour of my father and elder Nectarius.

'Nevertheless, we, out of respect for thy request, and out of affection for thee, take these his foul-mouthed and contumacious revilings as if they were a bouquet of sweet-smelling flowers; and by way of honour and praise for them we hold him absolved and blessed, and freed from the *just* curses of the patriarch Nectarius; and we make him not to have been affected by his guilt ever so little. And we are expecting the return of our archimandrite Prochorus with the alms of thy majesty, which are now

our only hope. Let thy mercy, most serene lord, be upon us, as we do put our trust in thee' (p. 553).

In the *Letter of Absolution* accompanying this, it is stated, that, 'Whereas Ligarides had been for certain sins suspended and degraded and excommunicated by the expatriarch Nectarius and by all the sacred synod of Jerusalem, and now the emperor Alexis &c. has asked of us a pardon for him, we, out of consideration for his request' (nothing being said of penitence) 'and of our affection for his holy and powerful empire, hold him, the said Paisius Ligarides metropolitan of Gaza for absolved and blessed of the Lord God Almighty and of our Saviour Jesus Christ, and freed from all excommunication and curse, &c. &c. Moreover, we have *recommended* to the holy city Jerusalem, to our father Nectarius, *and to all the synod*, that *they* should absolve him in like manner as he, by the grace of the Holy Ghost, is absolved by our humility, out of affection &c. for the tsar' (p. 557). Dated in Oct. 1669.

So these letters arrived at Moscow in the spring or summer of 1670, and the tsar gave the Letter of Absolution to Ligarides, in order that by its help he might satisfy the scruples of the new patriarch Joasaph, and regain the status which he had lost. The letter, however, was objected to as ambiguous and incomplete, seeing that it was only personal from Dositheus, and he only promised to *recommend* to Nectarius and *the local synod* to do the same, whereas the excommunication had been not only made originally by Nectarius, but also at his instance by the local synod. They might have added, if they knew it, that there had been two excommunications, one earlier, for crimes of impurity, in pronouncing which the local synod of Jerusalem had joined with the patriarch, or had repeated his sentence; the other later, for heresy, when the patriarch of C.P. Methodius had joined the patriarch of Jerusalem Nectarius in anathematising a book written by Ligarides, together with its author.

Hereupon Ligarides addressed a petition to the tsar, no longer speaking of calumnies, nor pretending innocence, but merely pleading that the absolution obtained *was valid* and *sufficient*, and praying for 'a righteous revision' of the unfavourable conclusion come to by the Russian patriarch Joasaph and the bishops.

But after this time he no longer appeared as a public character. His History was not 'defended,' *i.e.* taken up by the tsar, to whom it was dedicated; nor translated and published: what he wrote in it (p. 101) of his complete acquittal having been pronounced by the three patriarchs would no longer hold good: the charges for uttering which Agathangelus and others were imprisoned till they retracted them were now *known* by the tsar at least to have been true: and what Ligarides falsely pretended to have whispered into the ear of Nicon, 18 July 1663 (p. 79), was to become a voice uttered audibly in the ears of all the world by himself against himself, and to the unspeakable disgrace of the Russian Church and empire. Henceforth he neither hoped to be restored to the see of Gaza, nor to succeed Joasaph as patriarch of Moscow, nor to obtain for his zeal a pension from the Propaganda: but he lived on at Moscow under surveillance, strangers, as Heinsius in March 1671 (p. 8), being forbidden

to hold intercourse with him, and he being forbidden to hold intercourse with them; and he died there, as it is said, in 1678.

The tsar Alexis in the mean time (in Jan. 1676) had sent from his death-bed to ask once more, for *himself*, *Nicon's* forgiveness and prayers, having already before written in his will these words: 'Farther, of my spiritual father, the great hospodin, most holy hierarch and blessed pastor, the patriarch Nicon, though by the judgments of God he is not in this place (*i.e.* in this chair of Moscow), I ask *absolution* and *forgiveness*.'

HISTORY OF THE LOCAL SYNOD

HELD AT MOSCOW

AGAINST NICON, HERETOFORE PATRIARCH:

COMPOSED BY

PAISIUS THE SCIOTE, METROPOLITAN OF GAZA.

PREFIXED BY THE TRANSLATOR.

'Some Notices of Paisius Ligarides before his coming to Russia, Moscow, 1862.'

PAISIUS' name originally was Pantaleon Ligarides; and by this name Dositheus, patriarch of Jerusalem (in his *History of the Patriarchs of Jerusalem*), says he is mentioned in the book Τάγρα. He was born in Scio. His fellow-countryman and contemporary, Leo Allatius, says that the Greeks of that isle (which for about 240 years was under the Genoese) often sent their sons for education to Rome, and to other Latin cities; and such youths, on their return, enjoyed special consideration, and received from the Greek bishops permission to teach the sciences. (*De Eccl. Occ. et Or. perpet. consens.* lib. iii. ch. x. § 4.) Paisius in his early years did thus. He entered for instruction the college not long before (in A.D. 1578) opened at Rome by Pope Gregory XIII. for Greeks, in which Jesuits were the teachers. Here, under the name of the pure ancient Greek doctrine, Greek youths were taught the doctrine of the Roman Church. Hence in those times went forth many of the first instruments of the Unia in south-western Russia: as the metropolitans of Kieff Joseph Veliamin-Routzky, Raphael Korsak, Antony Seliava, and Cyprian Jochofskoy; the archbishops of

Smolensk Laurentius Krevsha and Andrew Zloty; of Polotsk Nicholas Losotsky, and Nicephorus Gojonsky; the bishops, of Volhynia Jerom Grochofskoy, of Loutzk Jeremiah Pochapofsky, of Pinsk Pachomius Oransky, of Touroff Alexis Dubovich, and the coadjutor-bishop of Vilna Marcian Trizna. Among those who issued later from the same school Allatius names also *Pantaleon Ligarides of Scio.* (*Ib.* p. 986, 996.)

The time that Pantaleon studied at Rome we cannot fix exactly: but we know when he left Rome. Leo Allatius in 1645 wrote to his friend Bartold Negusi: 'Pantaleon Ligarides three years ago left Rome for Constantinople, to visit his native isle of Scio, and to diffuse in those parts the Roman faith.' But the hopes which he built on the favour of the then patriarch of C.P., Cyril of Berœa, were not realised. This patriarch had been raised to the chair in the room of Cyril Lucar, deposed by the influence of the Latin party [the French embassy] at C.P., and was considered to be favourable to the Latins, who even called him their disciple. But he was soon forced to make way for Parthenius. After this Allatius added also: 'But from trustworthy information it seems that Pantaleon's affairs are not in a good way with the new patriarch, who has been raised to the chair by the heretics. O that this journey had fallen to my own lot!' (*Philippi Cyprii Chronicon Ecclesiæ Græcæ*, 1687, p. 437, 438.)

And so Pantaleon left Rome probably in 1642. At that time he was already known by some publications. In 1637 he published, with the book of Neophytus Rodino [of Potamion in Cyprus] his fellow-student at Rome, his *Apology for Peter Arcudius* (known by his zealous labours for the promotion of the Unia in south-western Russia and among the Greeks). And in connection with another work of the same Neophytus, entitled a *Commentary on the Song of the B. Virgin, the Magnificat, &c.*, Pantaleon printed a letter of his own to the archbp. of Naples. This last letter, so far at least as its dedication or inscription goes, was known to the patriarch Nicon, who regarded it as a ground for suspicion, because in it Pantaleon calls the Latin archbishop his 'most honoured lord.' [Nicon mentions this both in his Vozrajenia and in his letter to the patriarch Dionysius of C.P. In the former he says, 'And a testimony against him (of his Latinism) was brought here by Theophanes, archim. of the monastery

of Constantine on Mount Athos; viz. a little book entitled a *Commentary on the Magnificat*, printed at Rome; and in it there is his name by which he was known in the world, Pantaleon Ligarides.' *Replies of Nicon*, pp. 550 and 586.]

The changes of the patriarchs made at C.P., it is plain, were not opportune for the views of a disciple of the Jesuits. He left Constantinople.

From about 1650 we find him in Hungro-Wallachia, with the metropolitan of Tergovist Stephen. Here he, with his countryman the hieromonach Ignatius Petritsi, was employed in preparing for the press an edition of the Kormchay (the Πηδάλιον), then translated from the Greek into the Wallachian (or Roumanian) language. From the preface of this book it appears that the metropolitan Stephen had long been seeking for a collection of the canons of the Greek Church in a true copy, and had even written letters on the subject to the patriarch of C.P. with requests for assistance. But at last he found a good copy of the canons in the possession of his own spiritual son George Karidi of the city of Triki; and, with the consent of the voivode Matthew Bassaraba, and his council, he determined to translate them, and to print the translation at the voivode's press. This work was intrusted to a monk named Daniel; but he not being himself enough of a scholar, invited the assistance of the learned strangers the hieromonach Ignatius, and Pantaleon Ligarides. (See the Vienna Journal entitled *Jahrbücher der Litteratur*, 1824, xxv. Band, p. 158.) So it appears, from his being still named Pantaleon, that Ligarides was not yet a monk, nor ordained to any ecclesiastical order. The voivodes of Moldavia and Wallachia at that time, by their liberality to monks, attracted to themselves many Greeks; and it was in those principalities first that educational institutions of a higher kind were organised, and printing-presses set at work, before anything of the kind was done among the Greeks themselves. They did not fear to translate even Latin books into the Slavonic tongue, and to print them. Thus in 1647 there was printed at the expense of Helena the consort of Matthew Bassaraba, the *Imitatio* of Thomas à Kempis. And as translations into Slavonic were not intelligible to all, they began also to print books in the Roumanian language. One of the first works of this kind was an edition of the Kormchay published in A.D. 1652.

However, the fixed employment of Ligarides in the Roumanian principalities was that of a teacher in the school at Jassy. For to this time must be referred a notice of him inserted by the Greek Demetrius Procopii in his account of learned Greeks of the XVII. and of part of the XVIII. century (*Fabric. Bibl. Grac.* t. xi. p. 531). He calls Ligarides 'well instructed in all the sciences, and specially well acquainted with the divine scriptures;' and at the same time he describes him as being the master of the school at Jassy. That school was established by the voivode of the same time, Vasili Loupoulus, in virtue of a letter of the patriarch of C.P. Parthenius, at the same time that he reëstablished the rights of the chair of C.P. over the Moldavian Church; whereas to that time, from the time of the council of Florence, it had recognised the authority of the patriarch of Achrida. (Prince Cantemir's *Description of Moldavia*, Mosc. 1789, p. 364, &c.)

In what relation to Orthodoxy did Ligarides stand at this period of his life? In the school at Jassy, so far as there are any indications in the accounts of that time, there were no followers of the Roman Church. In the well-known controversy about the orthodoxy of the patriarch of C.P. Cyril Lucar, whom the Latin party sought to represent as a decided Protestant [as he personally was], the learned at Jassy did not adhere to such a judgment of him; and in the synod of Jassy, though the doctrine which had been published as Cyril's was condemned as contrary to that of the Eastern Church, Cyril himself was not condemned by name. Ligarides knew how to conform himself to every variety of opinion. In an orthodox school he knew how to appear orthodox; but *he did not break off his relations with his former companions of the Roman school*, and continued to represent himself *to them* as attached to Roman convictions. In this respect his letter to his fellow-countryman Leo Allatius is worthy of notice; a letter in which he tells a story of a miracle which an orthodox Russian priest could not perform, but which the Uniat bishop Joasaph Kuntsevich, as he pretends, performed. The account is given thus: A Russian priest was called to absolve a man who had died under the excommunication of the Church, and whose body in consequence had been found undissolved in the earth. The priest began his prayer of absolution thus: 'If we judge rightly in abhorring Azymites and Latin-

isers, O Lord our God, then' &c. But no miracle followed. Joasaph Kuntsevich was invited to try. He prayed thus: 'If we believe rightly that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father and the Son; that the archbishop of old Rome, according to the confession of the council of Florence, is the father and teacher of all Christians, and the vicar of Christ, and believe so as he believes, then' &c. Scarcely had he ended this prayer, writes Ligarides, when the corpse dissolved, &c. This extract from his letter shows on which side were the sympathies of Ligarides. We may add that this letter is still written by 'Pantaleon,' not 'Paisius.' So Ligarides is not yet a monk. (Nic. Comneni Papadopouli *Prænotiones Mystagogicæ*, 1697, p. 245, 246.)

His being tonsured to be a monk would necessarily tighten Ligarides' connection with Orthodoxy. He succeeded in recommending himself to the good graces of the then patriarch of Jerusalem Paisius, who lived long in the countries of Moldo-Vlachia and Hungro-Vlachia, having in Jassy itself four monasteries belonging to the Holy Sepulchre (Dositheus, patriarch of Jerusalem, *Hist. of the Patriarchs of Jerusalem*, book xii. ch. i. § 10), by name Galati, Bournouski, St. Saba, and Nikoritsi. It was from him that Ligarides received the tonsure, and with it the new name of Paisius, which covered all the past.

This took place at Jerusalem [whither, no doubt, Ligarides had accompanied the patriarch from Moldavia]. Our celebrated traveller of the 17th century, Arsenius Souchanoff [afterwards kellar of the Troitza], was godfather to Ligarides, and himself mentions this fact in his Travels. Arsenius had been sent from Moscow to the East to observe the forms and orders of divine service actually practised by the Greeks; and he went in company with the patriarch of Jerusalem, Paisius, first to Moldavia, in May 1649. At Jerusalem he did not arrive till Oct. 6th in 1651. On the way he passed some weeks (from 26th June to 19th July) in Scio, the country of Ligarides, and described minutely the manner of life of the Greeks and the Latins there. At Jerusalem, Arsenius writes, 16th November, it being Sunday, the patriarch celebrated in the church of the Resurrection. The same day, after the matins, the patriarch himself tonsured Ligarides, and having called to him Arsenius, bade him keep him under obedience strictly, 'as they keep novices at Moscow in the great monasteries' (MS. in the Moscow Synodal Library,

No. 573, Προσκυνητάριον of Arsenius Souchanoff, fol. 104). But at Jerusalem Arsenius remained till Easter in the following year (1652); and on the 27th of April he started to return, leaving his godson to look after his soul's interest for himself.

At that time of his being brought into contact with life at Jerusalem, and with the hierarchy of the Holy City, Paisius, as a man of learning and curiosity, employed himself in writing a *History of the Patriarchs of Jerusalem*. In what spirit he began and carried on that work, and how far he got [or how far he succeeded] with it, one may see from the words of the patriarch of Jerusalem Dositheus, who being a countryman of the patriarch Paisius, and having been in his service from his youth, must, beyond a doubt, have known Paisius personally, and who eventually availed himself of the preparatory labours of Paisius [*i.e.* the materials collected by him] for his own *History of the Patriarchs of Jerusalem*. Enumerating the Greek writers of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, he says of Paisius: 'Paisius Ligarides, of Scio, a Latiniser. He wrote an *Explanation of the Divine Liturgy*, but in a sense favourable to the innovations of the Roman Church. Also he wrote an historical work about those who have been patriarchs at Jerusalem, in folio, in 73 cahiers. From this work we ourselves derived very great assistance in the way of materials towards our present history. He wrote of the patriarchs down to the [reign of] Heraclius; but after Heraclius, he has said nothing to any good purpose [nothing sound] about them. One third part of the work perhaps consists of stories and narratives about the ascetics and the patriarchs; but two-thirds are against the Eastern Church; and especially against the sacred Photius, and in defence of the papal power. The patriarchs Methodius of Constantinople (1668-1671), and Nectarius of Jerusalem (1661-1669), having read through that history, and seeing in it the vilest railing against orthodoxy, delivered it to an anathema, and excommunicated Ligarides himself as a heretic' (Dosith. *Hist.* &c. book xi. ch. xi. § 7, fol. 1180). The successor of Dositheus in the chair of Jerusalem, Chrysanthus, in editing his history, does not disapprove of these severe remarks about the learned labours of Paisius; but he thinks to defend him by his *later writings*, in which he sees his zeal for the defence of orthodoxy against the attacks of the Lutherans (*Ib.* fol. 1181). This history of Paisius

has not come down to us in that form in which it was left by the author himself: we know only Dositheus' history [compiled from it]. And if that of Paisius deserved to be blamed for its partiality towards the Roman Church, that which we have, on the other hand, as re-written by Dositheus, is not so much a history as a polemical work against Popery based on history.

The patriarch Paisius was not so severe and inquisitorial in respect to the monk whom he had tonsured. Continuing his favour to him [but this was earlier, and there is no reason to think that he knew what Paisius was writing], he raised his namesake to the see of Gaza (between 1652 and 1656). But it seems that Paisius found it more to his own advantage to be constant to Wallachia and Moldavia than to his impoverished see. So it was at Wallachia that he was found by the patriarch Macarius of Antioch, at the end of 1656 and [in the beginning of] 1657, as he was on his way back from Moscow. The attendant of Macarius, the archdeacon Paul of Aleppo, who wrote an account of all the journey of his patriarch, relates how they fell in with Paisius, then metropolitan of Gaza, and what literary relations they had with him. (See *Travels of Macarius*, p. 343-4.)

From the journal of Macarius' son and archdeacon Paul it appears that Paisius in 1656 was already metropolitan of Gaza, and that not long before Macarius reached Wallachia from Moscow he had been in Palestine [between 6th Oct. 1651 and Easter, or 27th April 1652, he was at Jerusalem]; but had not remained there. [We may collect also from the same Travels of Macarius, and from an allusion in the *Replies* (Vozrajenia) of Nicon, that Paisius had served Stephen bey in that intrigue, by which he supplanted Vasili bey of Moldavia; and that afterwards, when the league formed between the Hungarians and the two beys, Stephen and Constantine of Moldavia and Wallachia, had led to the deposition of these latter, he was sufficiently compromised not to think himself safe in Wallachia, nor to stay on there, in company with the patriarch Macarius, in the Kozia convent, or elsewhere in the mountains, till the invasion of the Turks and Tatars was over: but he fled after the dethroned beys into Hungary, and there, in common with many others, was robbed of all that he had. In allusion to this the archdeacon Paul congratulates himself that he and the patriarch Macarius had not been induced, either by their own fears, or by the suggestion

and example of others, to continue their flight in like manner across the frontier. Afterwards Paisius returned to Wallachia.]

Of the acquaintance of Paisius with the ancient ecclesiastical literature, and of his love for rare books, we know also from his relations with the Belgian envoy at Moscow, Nicholas Heinsius, who received from him here a list of some sermons of the patriarch of C.P. Photius, till that time unknown to the learned. Among these sermons there were also those two remarkable ones which he preached on occasion of the inroad of the Russians against C.P., and which were only recently rediscovered on Mount Athos. (*Combefif. Auctuarium Novissim. Bibl. Patr.* tom. i. p. 549.) Heinsius, after his return to his own country, in March 1671, wrote of Paisius to one of his friends: 'Once I invited to visit me the metropolitan of Gaza, Paisius Ligarides, a Greek, very well educated, inasmuch as he had passed the best years of his life at Rome, an extremely polite old gentleman. [He may, perhaps, when Heinsius saw him, have been 54 or 55 years old.] But the next day, by direction of Athan. Laur. Nashchokin, who has the superintendence of all relations with foreigners, I was given to understand that it did not please them at the court that I, without asking permission of the tsar's majesty, had invited to come and see me a man *who stood so high among the clergy*. A like message was also sent to Paisius, for having complied with my invitation. So we were both shut off from any farther communications. Meanwhile I saw nobody who would have been better able than he would have been, by his conversation, to make me closely acquainted with Russian affairs.

When Paisius Ligarides was still in Wallachia he attracted the attention of the patriarch Nicon. Having need of learned men for that correction of the church books which he had undertaken, Nicon, by the recommendation of Arsenius Souchanoff, invited him to come to him to Moscow, and the more readily because he was informed that Paisius of himself was wishing to go to Russia. 'We have heard of thy learning,' he wrote to Ligarides, 'from the monk Arsenius, and that thou wishest to see us, the great hossoudar: therefore we also wish to receive thee with affection, as our son beloved in the Holy Ghost. Only, on receiving this our letter, do thy diligence to come to this capital city of Moscow.' At the same time (1 Dec. 1657) he wrote

to Stephen the voivode of Moldavia, and to Constantine the voivode of Hungro-Vlachia, as also to the metropolitans Gideon of Souchava and Stephen of Hungro-Vlachia, that they should facilitate his coming to Moscow. But it is not known why[1] Paisius did not immediately act upon this invitation, and only five years later made his appearance at Moscow, when Nicon was in an entirely different position: and he made his appearance then, probably in consequence of another invitation, not to assist the energetic patriarch in his useful enterprises on behalf of the Church, but to aggravate the difficulties of his struggle.

It was not so that Nicon regarded him at that time. No doubt under the influence of changed relations, and in consequence of fresh informations about Paisius, received from people who were not well disposed towards him, but knew him closely, Nicon wrote of him: 'Some report of him that he is not an orthodox son of the holy Eastern Church, but a member of the Western Roman kostel; that he was with the Pope thirty years as a deacon [rather, till the age of 30; which would make him to have been born in 1612, and to have been about 58 when Heinsius saw him in 1670]; and he lived among the Moutiani (Wallachians) a long time; and disseminated much Roman heresy. He bade widower priests to marry again; and said that young monks and nuns should marry, and eat meat. And the metropolitan of Moldavia wrote about him to the ecumenical patriarchs, and they anathematised him, and ordered that he should be unfrocked. And he went off from Wallachia to Poland; and in Poland he was a long time with the king, and he celebrated [mass] in all the kostels.' *Vozrajenia of Nicon, &c.* See the *Replies of Nicon*, p. 550-586.

In these sharp reproaches there is not only the anger of the wounded patriarch, but also, as is plain from the evidence we have discovered, the voice, to a great extent, of truth. The circumstances known to us; viz. Paisius' prolonged residence at Rome for study in a Roman college, necessarily joined with the renunciation of orthodoxy; his heterodox sentiments in his writings, and his condemnation by the patriarchs; the relations which he very probably kept up with his former fellow-students and ac-

[1] The cause may be inferred from all that is related in the Travels of Macarius concerning the troubles in the Principalities, and the deposition of the two boys Stephen and Constantine, followed by their flight, and that of Paisius himself, to Hungary. See pp. 340-345 and 352-367.

quaintances of the Roman school, who were now labouring for the propagation of the Unia within the Polish dominions,—all these things were not the inventions of an angry and revengeful spirit. Of the justice of other accusations we can say nothing, from our ignorance of the circumstances. But we have no ground for altogether rejecting them.

From the '*Historical Dictionary of Writers that have been in Russia of the Clergy of the Graeco-Russian Church:* by Eugenius, sometime Metropolitan of Kieff.'

PAISIUS in his letter to the tsar Alexis, 31 Dec. 1666, written to defend himself against the imputations cast upon him by Nicon, wrote that he had been protopope at Jerusalem; that afterwards he received the monastic tonsure, and was consecrated metropolitan for Thessalonica; and lastly translated, with the same rank, to Gaza in the patriarchate of Jerusalem. About the year 1660 [really in 1662] he came into Russia with a letter of recommendation from the patriarch of C.P. Parthenius Koumkoum, who represented him as a man well acquainted with the laws of the Church, and fit to be used in the business of examining the conduct of the patriarch Nicon. Hence it appears that they had called for either him, or some one like him, expressly for this affair. And in consequence he was received by the tsar and by the boyars, who were displeased with Nicon, very favourably. The boyar Simeon Lucianovich Streshneff, one of the most powerful of the patriarch's enemies, addressed to Paisius XXX. questions respecting the conduct of Nicon, and Paisius wrote upon them *canonical* answers in condemnation of Nicon. Afterwards he wrote all the communications of the tsar to the Eastern patriarchs in the affair of this patriarch, and was one of those who did most to stir up the Russian clergy against him. Hence Nicon did not spare him either to his face or to others, reproaching him with being *a runaway, a foreign vagabond, a heretic, who brought no canonical attestations of his quality.* And in fact it was afterwards discovered, and the tsar Alexis Mich. himself, in 1668, received from the patriarch of Jerusalem Nectarius a letter written to inform him that this Paisius, for his wilful and long absenting of himself from his see, and for certain crimes,

had been long before anathematised and deposed. For this reason, perhaps, it was that Paisius declined to take his place in the synod held at Moscow against Nicon. Nevertheless he was present in it, and subscribed with the rest the sentence [against Nicon], and the other synodal decrees which were made afterwards; and after that he obtained from the tsar his congé to return to his own country. But after having gone only as far as Kieff, he stopped there, while the tsar was interceding with Dositheus (who had succeeded Nectarius as patriarch of Jerusalem) and with Parthenius the patriarch of Constantinople, to obtain for him their forgiveness and absolution. In the mean time, while he was living at Kieff, with a pension from the tsar, he was invited into the academy there, to lecture on philosophy; but he discharged this duty only for some months; and it seems that he was beginning to send complaints against the clergy of Kieff, and to try to set the tsar against them. Where he died is not known; but he was again living at Moscow as late as the year 1676, as appears from his letters to the tsar, the originals of which, together with other acts and documents relating to the affair of Nicon, and with the letters and answers of the Eastern patriarchs, are preserved at Moscow in the archives of the foreign office. There also, among the papers of the late professor Barsoff, are still preserved the lectures given by Paisius on philosophy at Kieff, in the Latin tongue. Selli in his catalogue of writers says, that during the time that James Reitenfels, the Courlander, was staying in Moscow, Paisius compiled some notices on matters of faith (*commentaria nonnulla ad religionem spectantia*); and at the request of a Swede, who had come there as ambassador (John Liliental) in 1666, he wrote a treatise *On the Belief of the Greeks and Russians respecting the holy Eucharist* (*Tractatus de Fide Græcorum et Russorum circa sacrosanctum Eucharistiæ Mysterium*). According to Alb. Fabricius (*Bibl. Gr.* tom. x. p. 436) this treatise was published by Arnauld in 1666, in his book *De Perpetuitate Fidei Catholicæ de S. Eucharistiâ*. Fabricius, in the place referred to, places Paisius in the list of those Greeks who have Latinised. And in the archives of the foreign office at Moscow there are letters of his to Cardinal Barberini, and to Kelephin archbishop of Strigonia. All these letters, *as well as those to the tsar Alexis Michaelovich*, are written *in Latin*. (See above the article on the patriarch Nicon.) The Greek Deme-

trius Procopii, in the above-cited place, asserts that there were still preserved various compositions of his which had not been published. In the patriarchal library at Moscow there is among the Greek MSS. a preface written by him for a translation of the Nomocanon of Matthew Blastar into the modern Greek or Romaic dialect. [There is also at Jerusalem a treatise by him *On the Interpretation of Dreams*, written for the tsar Alexis, on occasion, no doubt, of some trouble or misgiving caused to him by those two remarkable dreams of the patriarch Nicon, which were communicated by him in writing to the tsar, and told besides to other people.] Tom. ii. p. 145-149 of 2d ed., S.P.B. 1827.

Translated from the work entitled '*Dell' Origine, Progresso, e Stato presente del Rito Greco in Italia, &c. da P. P. Rodota. Roma*, 1763.'

THE smaller number of the students in the Greek College (founded in 1577 by Gregory XIII.) has consisted and still consists of Oriental Greeks, while the majority are Basilian monks and Ruthenians and Italians, together with Italo-Greek secular students. If we speak only of the very few Eastern students, some of them have died in the same college, or soon after their return to their own countries, in the dispositions of true Catholics. Others, as incapable of any good training, have been sent back to their homes soon after coming to the college. An equal number, perhaps, have been restored to their families, at the age of 17 or 18, on account of bad health, without having acquired either solid virtue or learning. Of those who have gone out after finishing their course, some have given up their country, and have remained in Latin cities to avoid risk of their eternal salvation. Others, more courageous, have returned to Greece, and have there stood up against the schismatics, neither fearing their threats nor yielding to their persecutions. Both the one class and the other have obtained general celebrity by their learning, their moral virtues, their sufferings, or lastly the excellence of their works published in defence of the faith, &c. Others, recalled to their homes, either by their own natural love of their country, or by the necessity of looking after their patrimony, or by their vow of obedience to the college, have maintained consistently

in private houses the affections contracted in Rome. If the natural fear of grave affronts threatened them by the schismatics weakened their zeal for the salvation of others, the supernatural love of the divine truths learned among the Latins quickened their zeal for their own salvation. These have died in obscurity, leaving no memorial of virtuous actions. Others, lastly, from human weakness, have yielded to the seductions of their friends and relatives, to the contradictions of rulers, to the examples of their fellow-citizens. These in all do not exceed the number of ten, who have declared themselves enemies of the Roman Church: and of these two only have held any ecclesiastical dignity, viz. Pantaleon Ligarides, and Hilarion Cicala.

Concerning the former of these two there is appended in a note the following account:

'Pantaleon Ligarides, a Sciote by birth, of excellent parts, was sixteen years in the Greek College at Rome, where he made the best of his opportunities. He obtained the degrees of doctor in philosophy and in theology in the church of St. Athanasius, in presence of many cardinals. On that occasion he distinguished himself by his sharpness and readiness, and by his copious learning. One of those present proposed in Greek questions, which the respondent treated off-hand, with a rapidity and fulness which excited the admiration of all. After this, *having been ordained* [deacon and priest] by Raphael Korsak, Ruthenian metropolitan of Russia, he went to Constantinople, where, in the *public* meetings of bishops and Greek litterati [in the salons of one or more Catholic ambassadors, or the like?], he learnedly *defended the truths of Catholicism*, and with rare perspicuity and acuteness put to shame and silenced his opponents, as they were not able to withstand either *the vehemence of his zeal* or the force of the arguments by which he proved the preëminence of the pontifical authority over that of the other patriarchs. His zeal and his learning earned him the hatred of all the bishops, and more especially that of the patriarch of C.P., by whom he was *forbidden* either to celebrate the mass or to preach, was solemnly declared to be a layman, as having been ordained at Rome by a prelate united to the Holy See, and, finally, was cut off from all intercourse with mankind by an *excommunication*, which was notified to those who were in the habit of conversing with him. The patriarch, not content with having discharged

his thunderbolts against Ligarides, turned his *malice* against the Greek College. He declared in a public meeting of the bishops that it was the ruin of Greece; and made a decree not to receive them that had been educated there, but to treat them as disturbers of the *state*, and as the open and sworn enemies of the Greek nation. Ligarides might have easily avoided all these painful troubles, if he had consented to conform his maxims to the system of the schismatics: but he preferred to suffer the war of such fierce persecutions rather than purchase peace by acts of detestable sacrilege. That he might not, to no purpose, provoke still more the rage of the ungodly, he left Greece, where he reaped for his labours only thorns instead of fruits, and transferred himself to Moldavia *and to Muscovy, in order* by his learning and eloquence *to convince the obstinate schismatics* of those parts. *Here* he was elected *archdeacon of Jerusalem*, and bishop of Gaza. It is not known what sort of life he led in those countries. Thus much, however, is certain, that *he* had sufficient influence to extirpate there two abominable abuses, viz. that of rebaptising the Latins, and that of renewing every year an act of excommunication against the Pope. In the year 1637 he published at Rome a posthumous work of Arcudius, *De Purgatorio Igne, adversus Barlaam, Græc. Lat.*, with a learned and elegant preface, and dedicated it to Urban VIII. He died in 1678. A *gentleman of Constantinople*, who had been, during a long time, *intimately acquainted* with him *in Muscovy*, related to the superiors of the Greek College, that he had been present at his death, and remembered to have noticed in him clear signs of his firmness in the Catholic faith and in Christian piety. *It may seem* that *such an attestation* deserves more credit than any *reports* which have induced some other less well-informed person or persons to conclude that he was an apostate from the faith. The diversity of the reports, and the notices which have got abroad about him, has led *me* to reckon him *among them that have caused scandal*' (tom. iii. lib. iii. c. 7, p. 208).

DEDICATION.

To the most divine, most serene, and most religious Emperor of the thrice-happy and great city of Moscow, and of all Great, Little, and White Russia Autocrat, and of many other provinces and lordships august Despot by natural succession and inheritance, Kyr Kyr Alexis Michaelovich, Paisius Metropolitan of Gaza wishes health, victory, and salvation.

WHAT a certain rhetorician said as a figure of speech, and perhaps also out of adulation, to the most august Cæsar,—'O Emperor and absolute lord! whoever *dares* to approach thee is quite ignorant of thy unapproachable power; yet whoever *dares not*, is unaware of the compassionateness and benignity of thy rule,'—this I in literal and simple truth say to thee, our most excellent Autocrat, having had the closest general knowledge of thy innate nobility of heart, of thy accessibleness, and affability. I come therefore to thee, O irresistible, complete king (*παντάρακτα*), who hast set up so many trophies of victory over thy enemies visible and invisible, dedicating to thee, as an honourable tribute or votive oblation, this synodical book, which I have composed as a history from the beginning to the end of all that has been done against Nicon, diversified with multitudes of canons and curious matters, adorned with grave questions and answers, and flowered over in profusion with patriarchal decisions and synodical suggestions. I flatter myself that thou also, O most excellent and most divine Emperor, wilt feel thyself bound to take my part, and to defend most energetically this my diversified and beautiful composition, which holds fast to truth. For I swear by most imperial truth, that I have neither used rhetorical amplifications to set off its contents, nor have through haste, by understatements and slovenly curtailments, improperly depreciated them. But, like one of the old Spartans, so I have now written, leaning as it were on my own spear and shield, with the famous saying on my lips, 'Either with it or upon it!' that is, *Either* I will bring back my shield in triumph, or I will

be brought back upon it myself dead. Or again, I have written as leaning on my pastoral staff and crook, and remembering that it has handles and hooks, like an anchor, to this end, to bring home to itself them that are straggling, and to fix them by the Spirit, and also to discipline the unruly, and to drive off such as are enemies and marauders, and mentally like evil beasts; so that I think there is no room for any mocking Momus, or sour Zoilus, or cutting Archilochus or Hipponax, to attack satirically my performance. But if any one presumptuously attack me, I will put them to flight as the Lapithæ put to flight the Centaurs; like Triptolemus, I will sow on the lands the grains of my words; like Abaris, I will fly on my winged arrow to Greece; or like Gyges, who gloried in his magic ring. I will smite them with the club of Hercules; I will shake at them the trident of Neptune; and as another Carneades [the founder of the later Academy and preacher of universal scepticism], I will come in boasting of my Olympic victories. It is related of Phidias, that celebrated sculptor of antiquity, that when he had completed his masterwork of the Olympian Jupiter, he set it up in a public thoroughfare, where it would be seen by many, that each person as he passed by might show what he thought of it, while he himself, standing concealed behind the statue, took note of what was said, and then afterwards at home he retouched his work, so as to defer to the more generally expressed opinions. And the great painter Apelles, hearing a cobbler criticise a boot which he had painted, accepted his criticism at once, taking it for granted that the cobbler understood his own art. So I too should be very glad, if it were possible, to collect together all those of my own art, and immediately to set about correcting whatever appeared to them faulty in my work. For I am not a Hippias, who ambitiously pretend to be master of every science, and of all logical method, and of every inferior art; nor a Gorgias, boasting myself able to speak on any subject or question, and to resolve it at once and out of hand. But I have a great dread of the envy of my fellows; inasmuch as, according to Chrysostom, any expressions of approval from one's neighbours are food for malignity; and the more part are like putrid flies in ulcers: whence also the Ascræan bard (Hesiod) sings, 'Potter hates potter, and each artificer his fellow of the same art, and the poor man hates the poor.' Therefore, as of old, they who were ill able to speak, and

destitute of all the Attic eloquence, sought for themselves advocates and patrons to plead for them in the courts, looking to the necessity which pressed them, and seeking opportune protection and consolation, so I too have taken upon myself to choose thy most mighty dominion to be my patron and advocate, or *pro*-locutor and *al*-locutor; that I may apply also that verse of my friend, the tragedian Æschylus, who sings of that incredible wonder of the speaking oaks, which gave out oracles as with human voice. Wherefore, supplicating thee, even as men used to supplicate those oracular oaks, I also now bend the knee of my heart to thee, praying that thou wilt not leave me to sleep [that thou wilt not forget me], but wilt continue always to be towards me such as I have hitherto known thee, my vindicator and defender against every spiteful Telchin and Titan of frenzied men, who, like noisy Corybants, may attack and vilify and be angry against this my work, calumniating it as verbose, as *cunningly dishonest, as partial and unprincipled* (or as that of a reckless partisan, παραφόρῳ), *full of invective*, overladen with accusations, and a mass of all manner of libels. But I will say in my defence, O most just Emperor, that my history is so composed, to use the words of the Attic Thucydides, as to be a valuable possession for ever, and a fair mirror of human life. I know, farther, that it is a most available source whence to draw correction, a most true discipline, in the words of the admirable Polybius; yea, and in those of Dionysius of Halicarnassus, a mine of prudence and wisdom, and a school for conduct in political affairs; also an example of good counsel and an embodiment of truth, in the words of the most learned Plutarch. Hereby I have been taught to speak the truth, and utterly to reject all idea of flattery, holding tight to simple accuracy; because, when once upon a time some fell foul of the Macedonians as speaking indiscreetly, that is, without flattery or art, Philip, the son of Amyntas, replied to them thus: 'My Macedonians, being by nature simple, rude, matter-of-fact people, call a tub a tub and figs figs.' I too am as one of those ancients for this simplicity, straightforward and unpolished: and as I have known the facts to be, so I conscientiously relate them in my work, neither suppressing nor adding anything whatever, but relating all straightforwardly and simply, neither swelling my narrative with pleonasms, nor depriving it of its due body, and as the index of a

sundial, which faithfully casts the shadow, representing the whole truth without partiality or misgiving, as I know it to be. For I would rather be a truthful writer than a sophist or collector of lies, falsifying the original sources of information, or passing off for original documents forgeries. I declare, with Pythagoras, that exactly as I have known, and *as I had guessed before* of Nicon, so also I have passed my judgment against him, and so I describe and paint him, using words as dyes, and figures of speech as colours, showing no undue favour or indulgence. But if any one shall hereafter attempt to blacken with sinister annotations [lit. to obelize, χάζειν] this my history, and to depreciate it, and write to refute it, as once Philoxenus, the dithyrambic poet of Cythera, did by the works of Dionysius, let him remember how that Philoxenus was cast into the quarries at Syracuse *for not praising the tragedies of the tyrant.* However, I well know that I shall be celebrated and crowned hereafter even by my enemies themselves, and by them that now seem to be Niconists. Though they will dissemble and will not openly blush, still, from the reproaches of conscience, they will let out the truth even in spite of themselves. For such is the nature of virtue, that when it is looked in the face, it is admired at bottom even by them that impugn it; and, on the contrary, such is the nature of vice and evil, that even with those who follow it, it is at once condemned; and all [both good and bad] with one voice render homage to virtue. For as my friend Gregory the Theologian has it, 'war knows how to admire valour:' the truth of which assertion the great captain Gainas confirmed when he saw with what freedom of speech and boldness St. John Chrysostom discharged his mission towards the empress. So that I might quote the words of the prophet, and say, 'They that trouble me shall become weak and fall to the ground; they shall be plucked up by the roots and hurried away,' as by a torrent. Therefore, having found a firm base and standing-ground in thy imperial protection, I shall have a breastplate of reasonable boldness and not of rash audacity, having arms to defend myself against all; yea, being clad in full armour, having for my panoply thy protective defence [ἀλεξητικὴν ἀλέξησιν, playing upon the tsar's name Alexis], and thy equity and goodness, as the herb μόλυ healing wounds, and νηπενθὲς to be a help against poisons, and a safeguard and salutary medicament (ἀλεξιφάρμακον, καὶ ἀλεξιτήριον, καὶ παιώνιον). And,

to speak with Nicander: 'May this great protection (*ἀλέξιμον*) so be!'

And, in truth, were I to imitate those who are nice in noticing words and letters, and skilful in making words express manners, and in marking the etymologies of names, and distinguishing cases, and making happy anagrams and plays on them, I should say that the Most High has given thee the name *Alexis* to show that He has chosen thee to be the saviour and helper of ruined Greece. Let us consider the letters of thy name, and let us examine and smelt them, as men smelt the ore of metals. Ἀλέξιος, Alexios: Α is *ἄρξεις*, 'thou shalt rule;' λ, *λαοῦ*, 'over the people;' ε, *ἐλευθέρου*, 'freed [by thee];' ξ, *ξενοπρεπῶς*, 'marvellously:' ι, Ἰσμαὴλ, 'the Ishmaelite;' ο, *ὀλέθριον*, 'the destroyer;' ς, *συντρίψεις*, 'thou shalt crush.' Yea! yea! Be to us in deed, as in name, a defender (*ἀλέξιος*), as a lover of Christ; an Alexander or helper of men (*ἀλέξανδρος*), as a lover of God; dispelling from us miseries and dangers, according to the signification of thy name. It is sung in poetry that a philosopher named Eudemus was in the habit of making certain rings which he called preservatives (*ἀλεξιτήρια*), and hanging them about as guardian amulets affording protection (*ἀλέξησιν*) and bringing the greatest succour. There is also in Hesiod a certain earth mentioned as *ἀλεξιάρη*, *i.e.* as defensive against a curse; and in Nicander a certain branch or shoot called *θηριακὴ*, *i.e.* having virtue against beasts, or *ἀλεξιάρη*, defensive against war or against a curse. In truth, the thorn called *rhamnus* is good to relieve the smart of them that have been bitten by reptiles; and it is also celebrated for a poison-dispelling virtue against the plague. And what shall I say more of thy name Alexis, but that I wish thee *ἀλεξέμεναι*, to defend [according to its signification] in the words of Homer? God, the ruler of the universe, the Almighty, grant that the word spoken by the blessed Andrew, the fool for Christ's sake, may be fulfilled, and, that the seventeenth of the twenty-four Greek letters (the letter *ρ*, *r*, and the number *ρ'*, 100) may be accomplished and completed in the nation of the Russians during this present time of thy all-admirable and thrice-happy reign [*i. e.* mayest thou reign 100 years!] O, when shall my ears hear the hymn of the most prophetic Moses, that 'one of you shall chase a thousand'? Ah, when shall be fulfilled the most divine oracle of Me-

thodius of Patara,[1] who says, 'Lift up thy bow upon the clouds, and show signs in heaven and wonders upon earth'? When, O when, shall be the fulfilment of that wonderful prophecy, 'I will give the sinner into his hands, and I will turn and take vengeance for his blood'? When, O when, shall the two nations arise, whose language and speech shall be one [*i.e.* Muscovy and Lithuania, if the succession to the crown of Poland should be obtained by the tsar Alexis], and make war in the place where is the perforated stone? For they shall put to flight all Ismael. Then shall be destroyed the men of the tyrant city, as wax melteth from the presence of the fire. Then shall be fulfilled what was spoken by the prophet, 'The lion and the lion's whelp shall chase the wild asses.' However, these things are at the disposition of God (*Θεοῦ ἐν γούνασι κεῖται*). But in the mean time do thou receive with thy accustomed generosity and thy most condescending benignity this my history, which at the first glance may seem vituperative (*στηλιτευτική*), but is really and in truth demonstrative (*ἀποδεικτική*), even as Ptolemy king of Egypt graciously accepted the admirable Pharos which Sostrates erected; and as Memnon king of Media was pleased with the golden house. And as men praised Zenodorus, who designed the Colossus of Rhodes to the honour of Apollo, and Hermodorus, who erected the wonderful obelisk; which monuments not all time has been able to efface, but has left their crowns abiding even to the present day, so do thou accept as a statue [made in honour of thyself] this my historical narrative, not composed in ten years, as Isocrates is said to have taken ten years to study and complete his Panegyrical Oration; nor, as the most illustrious Cinnamus said of his Myrrh, that it had been ten years composing; but written in a few months, with the most potent facility given me from above for the finishing and perfecting of the work. For not crimes only were cut and recorded on pillars (whence the word *στηλίτευσις*) for infamy, but also good and honourable deeds were similarly inscribed for a perpetual memorial, to transmit them to future times. Thus Apollodorus set up the column which still bears the name of Trajan at Rome. But forgive me, yea, I pray thee, if as an unskilful artist I have failed worthily to cut and inscribe thy *heroic* actions; as Plato also confessed

[1] Really of another much later Methodius. See *Replies of the Patriarch Nicon*, in the Appendices, p. 665.

against himself, and by so doing rather enhanced the merits and great deeds of the Athenians. Yet this only, as he says, may be enough and suffice, if we say that, as all the radii of a circle meet in one centre, and all the rivers and seas flow into the vast and deep ocean, so all the ideas of the virtues and all the beauties of the Graces run up into thee, and in thee each one of them joins all the rest, thou all-imperial and most divine monocrat Kyr Kyr Alexis Michaelovich; to whom may the Giver of life grant the years of Methuselah, the cycles of Arganthonius (king of Tartessus, who lived 120 or 300 years), the Olympiads of Nestor (who was said to have lived 300), and the years of the Macrobii (of Ethiopia, of whom it was reported that they commonly lived to the age of 120), for the *support of the ecclesiastical firmament*, for the ingathering (*περίληψιν*) of the fulness of the people of Christ, for the illustration of the imperial diadem, and confirmation of the beauty of the universe. And let all the people say, Amen! Amen! Amen!

FRONTISPIECE.

A Portrait of the Character of Nicon, heretofore Patriarch, sketched physiognomically for the reader to contemplate, and for a pleonastic exposure of him (*παρεξέλεγχον*).

SINCE history is mute painting, and painting is history speaking, we will sketch and prefix here a portrait of the ex-patriarch Nicon, and exhibit the man himself, so far as a portrait can represent him, to posterity. For when he was patriarch he caused himself to be painted at full length in handsome pictures, numbering himself, while yet living, with the most holy hierarchs of the Church.[2] Nay, and even after his patriarchate was over, he still had himself painted at full height, wearing a rich mitre, and

[2] Such contemporary portraits of Nicon are still to be seen in the church of the Novospass monastery which he restored when archimandrite there, and in that of the patriarchal palace which he built from the foundations. Here he is represented together with the other five patriarchs of Moscow who had preceded him. At Voskresensk also there is preserved in the church a large picture of him as the founder, surrounded by his clerks and disciples, painted not after his deposition from the patriarchate, but after his retirement from Moscow.

attended by a group of deacons and clerks; not remembering—*he that had no form nor comeliness*—how Plotinus, the most Platonic philosopher, though he had a handsome countenance and a faultless figure, was too modest to allow himself to be painted, thinking this to be unbecoming a philosopher. But Nicon, who was rather like aboriginal matter (which the philosophers tell us is without qualities, without form, without figure),—Nicon, I say, delighted to be painted and decked out, he whose bare look and expression was altogether more unpleasing and shapeless than that of any hobgoblins (ἴμπουσαι), which in mythology are called Lamiæ and Mormolycæ.

I myself—yea, by truth that is dear to me—before I had ever seen the famous Nicon, was extremely curious to set my own eyes upon his form, and so sought anxiously for an opportunity to get a sight of him, even if it were in an imperfect and misleading portrait (παραγώγῳ εἰκόνι). And after a long time I gained my wish: for a certain excellent painter, a German, named John, with whom I was familiar, knowing the greatness of my curiosity, came one day, and brought me a large portrait of Nicon, which when I beheld, and had looked steadily at it, I was struck dumb. In good faith, I saw a Kalikancher, or one of the fabled Cyclopses, Giants, or Hippocentaurs, or an Ephialtes, that is, an incubus or nightmare which comes and sits upon one in sleep, the very name of which is a terror, and the actual presence worse. After a few moments, recovering myself, I uttered that half-line of Nonnus, Ὀφθαλμοί, τί τὸ θαῦμα! O, my eyes! what a monster! and began to think them happy that have no eyes, or that are born blind, so as to be in no danger of beholding such a monster of a man, with a wild-beast yoke-bent forehead. And Perseus indeed, who fought a fearful fight (γοργῶς) with the Gorgons, and slew Medusa, whose aspect turned all beholding her to stone, hid himself with a mirror, so as to be invisible, and using a spear with a sickle-shaped end cut off her head, and escaped himself unhurt. But he who came unawares on the sight of Nicon was in danger, like a man whose eye has fallen on a fierce wolf: and he at once from that moment had all his senses suspended. For such a one fascinates all alike, all but killing them that approach him, even before he has uttered a word, by his malignant truculent look, coming upon them like an inhuman Telchin. My friend the painter smiled, and said, 'What

will you give me'—'If you will make revelations?' I continued, interrupting him. Perhaps you will show me that those physiognomical conclusions which I may draw are untrustworthy, as being based only on guess, a foundation utterly deceptive, and upon an art or faculty full of uncertainty and fancifulness; indeed, on an assumption and an aftersound remote from the courts of God, and by common consent condemned and rejected by the divine Fathers.' But he replied in a contrary sense, saying, 'No: to speak so would not be at all like a philosopher, but rather like *one of the fanatics;* like a man still in the mud of vulgar prejudices; for that proverb is true which says, "He is the best of seers who guesses well." And, not to quote Homer, who in different places gives us outward hints and embodiments (as in the third book of the Odyssey, about Thersites, "I will show you him, what sort of a man he was: his back was humped over the shoulders; he had black straight hair on his head;" and in the ninth book of the Iliad about Hector, "having the eye of a Gorgon or of murderous Mars"), I will not let you off without quoting to you the physiological guesses of your friend Gregory the Theologian to the disadvantage of Julian the Apostate. For this father, in his second philippic against Julian, writes as follows:

"At that time then I made, as I know now, no bad guess of the man's character, though I am not naturally sharp, as some are, in such matters: but a sort of divination was produced in me by the inequality of his temper and manners, and by the vehemence of his transports; if at least the saying be true, that he is the best of prophets who guesses well. For I thought nothing good could be portended by his long, ill-set neck; his shoulders ever in motion, shrugged up and falling again; his restless eye, ever wandering about him, and having an expression of madness; his feet tottering and knocking one against the other; his nostril breathing contempt and insult; the changes of his countenance ridiculous, and expressive of ridicule; his immoderate and convulsive bursts of laughter; his nods of assent or dissent given with no manner of sense or reason; his delivery embarrassed and interrupted by breathing and puffing; his questions put at random, without judgment; his answers no better than his questions, interfering one with another, not consistent, nor showing the order of a good education. Why should I enu-

merate all particulars? As regards this man, before he manifested himself by his actions I knew him: and if any of them that were then my companions and heard what I said were here, they would, I am sure, bear me witness that I said to them from the first time of my seeing and noticing these things, 'What a plague is the Roman empire rearing for itself!' adding that I hoped I might turn out hereafter to have been a false prophet."'

The science, then, of natural expressions, and the art of physiognomy which distinguishes them, is not a fanciful invention of sophists, nor a mere trope of manœuvring rhetoricians. For the admirable Plato has said in his Polities, that there are in the soul four passions (*παζήματα*) or faculties, intelligence in the highest part, understanding in the second, belief (*πίστις*) in the third, and in the fourth guess or conjecture. I do not deny then that the art of physiognomy deals with guessing, because it has no necessary demonstration to give, but ends with guessing only and conjecturing upon certain grounds of probability. A certain physiognomist named Zopyrus, on seeing Socrates, immediately cried out, 'Babai! what a downward propensity this man has towards all bodily passions and lusts!' And when Socrates' disciples laughed to scorn his pretensions, and twitted his divination with being senseless and unlucky, their master interposing commended the physiologist, saying, 'Such I was indeed naturally, before I studied wisdom, O my children; but philosophy has supernaturally healed my natural propensities, and by laborious effort has corrected me, and has licked into shape my ungainly soul, as a she-bear affectionately licks her cubs.' However, nature is an ever-sounding echo, and a never-silent voice of the God of the universe, which in each of the creatures cries aloud and sounds in plants his word, 'Let the earth bring forth;' in the living creatures, 'Increase and multiply:' and this nature is called by the poets Pasiphaë; but by the philosophers it is defined to be the principle of the innate inclination, the cause of the inward propensity and gravitation: but among the outer barbarians, who are not Greeks, it is described as the daughter and assessor of the Demiurge, and the soul and harmony of the universe. And it is not without propriety that as in the great world the Creator has set in the heavens the stars as signs, so in the microcosm of man he has set the uncertain and hidden indications of physiognomy, manifested to very few who are able to

detect them, and not to the multitude. Thence it is that physiognomic determination of the human form and mathematical anthropology searches out and distinguishes the appropriate signs of the body apparent or non-apparent, general and particular, in each part and in the individual man; and it searches these out not superficially, considering accurately, generally, and upon the whole, and searching particularly the *quantity* of the body, whether it be great in its length or short in its size, and its *quality*, whether the person examined be of white complexion or of black; what is the shape of the limbs, the form of the countenance, the sound of the voice, the tone of the pronunciation, and in brief all the particulars, everything that goes to constitute the idiosyncrasy, that causes sympathy and antipathy, or conspires towards any certain effect in reference to the general temperament of the body.

These principles being laid down previously and known, only look, in the name of the Graces, at Nicon's *head*, of what a monstrous size and how thick-skinned it is! One might very appropriately write on it the epigram, 'What a head! and it has no brains!' For such men are usually most senseless and most unlearned, as have extraordinarily great heads and limbs. Look too at his *hair*, how black it is, like the ruffles of a raven, or the mane of a wild boar: and as the poets represent Neptune, calling him 'black-maned.' Then look at his *face*, looking as fierce as a tiger, and as savage as a bear; wherefore also 'sharp bile sits at his nostril' (ὀριμεῖα χολὴ ποτὶ ῥινὶ κάθηται), as sings the Syracusan poet Theocritus, to the disadvantage of Pan; signifying his irascibility. But since your friend Aristotle teaches us not to make sure or trust to one limb or part of the body only, but to consider all, or the greater number and the most important, from which the composition and temperament of the whole strikes the beholder even at a distance, let us consider the signs of these upper parts, as being much more certain and veracious than the rest. Look then, whoever knows anything of foreheads, at his *forehead* (for the distinguishing of a man's forehead is a sort of portrait-painting of itself, as that is an epitome of the whole countenance), in which are fixed effrontery and obstinacy: at his ears, long and large like those of Midas, most worthy to take in bitter announcements of rebuke and condemnation: at his open nostrils, manifestly characteristic of all his

ignoble hollowness and his posturing hypocrisy. What need is there to dwell on his sharp teeth, altogether cynical (*i. e.* like those of a dog), proclaiming his ferocity and his insatiate ravening? What shall we say of his straight long neck, like that of a cock? is it not plainly the minister of gluttony? What of the tendons of that same neck, soft in their flabbiness? are they not an indication of remissness and sloth?[3] Yea, and the thickness too of this neck seems to bear witness against his proud arrogance: at the same time it represents his irascibility, and his disposition to provoke and to exasperate. Within it is a φάραγξ (a gullet, or rather gulley) for meats: without it is a λάρυγξ (a larynx), more greedy than any cormorant (λάρυγξ λάρου λαρώτερος), and expresses his austere humour. So again his long thick beard is *known* (γιγνώσκεται) as a worker of disgust (ἀηδίας), and is to be pointed at as an index (γνώμων) of injustice. In like manner his long moustache under his nostrils betokens his peculiar want of discretion, and his crass ignorance. But thou—O thou gaping, and unbridled, and unshuttable [lit. doorless] mouth! for I address thee as if thou wert a living thing; thou ill-starred and rascally member! thou full of all roguery, and running over with all subtlety to pervert justice, which couldest never speak a word to the purpose, but wert used only to blatter forth whatever came uppermost! and thou, O tongue, which hast learned to talk till thou oughtest to ache at thine own loquacity, utterer of vain words, leader of blasphemy, bringing to birth intrigues, how long wilt thou hiss like a goose against us, carrying thyself with pompous contumacy against *all the teachers of the gospel*, who have been tricked and baffled by thee in thy desperate madness with ten thousand artful and desperate devices; thou that art naturally the *support* of *supposititious* terrors and evils! Who can find figures of speech to do justice to the remaining parts of his body? I commend greatly the Eastern painters of sacred forms for their custom of painting half-lengths only, judging and acting therein decently. These painters, then, I will now imitate, and not say anything of what is hidden and private for the sake of modesty and gravity. Yet, lest any one should say that we pass over the rest of the members as recognising in them signs of virtue and evidences of a good nature, I will specify farther his broad breast as announc-

[3] For the same imputation, see the *Replies of Nicon*, p. xxx. and 108, 9.

ing emptiness and folly, and his short *μετάφρενον* (space between the shoulder-blades) as full of intrigue and deceitfulness. O broad shoulders of Nicon, expressive of cowardice and pusillanimity! O empty sides, workers of evil counsel, heralds of impudence! O angry breast, girt as Cithæron of old with furies and bacchanals! O portly and fat belly, in which is verified the proverb, *παχεῖα γαστὴρ χρηστὸν οὐ τίκτει νόον* (A fat belly does not produce a good mind)! O hands more rapacious than those of Briareus! O fingers slender and short, witnesses of parsimony and mismanagement! O—but why do I lengthen my words beyond measure? It is enough to say that he was conceived, begotten, and born in Saturn, and under the horoscope of Saturn. But whosoever is born at the time that Saturn is in the zodiacal sign of the Bull must needs have an evil mind and evil actions, and through the cold air falls into excesses of mind and derangement of the senses. Wherefore I think I may close this my portraiture of Nicon with this epigram: *Νείκωνος μορφὴ ἔριδας καὶ νείκεα φράζει· Τὴν φύσιν ἀλλάξαι ἡ χάρις οἶδε μόνη.* (Strife and contention breathe in Neicon's form; 'Tis grace alone that nature can amend.)

HISTORY OF THE LOCAL SYNOD

HELD IN 1666.

Chap. I. *Introduction.*

[After a verbose proœmium] . . . . . God as the sovereign of the universe and the sun of justice, shining upon all the nations under heaven, has bestowed upon them all the kingly dignity, so that there neither is nor ever has been any race or people whatsoever which has not at one time or another been ruled by kings, though in some cases it may have been only for a short time; God thus declaring that the kingly office is not of mere human will and invention, but a divine gift and universal provision. . . . Having laid this down, I will go on at once to my subject, and will say that, in all that I shall relate concerning the affair of Nicon, I will be scrupulously just as an Areopagite, neither garbling, adding, exaggerating, nor suppressing anything out of partiality or antipathy; yea, by God omniscient, and by truth, which I prize above all things; and, like Socrates, I will be even hyper-veracious when I have to relate anything concerning myself or them that were with me and on the same side. For in most of the meetings, if not in all—in those, that is, which were held privately—I was present, sometimes having questions put to me, and sometimes answering and giving my own judgment: so that there are but a very few of the things that were done which are not thoroughly known to me: especially as to all that took place in the way of cause and effect connectedly and consecutively, I have all that had preceded distinctly in my mind, and firmly fixed in my memory. And hence I think that it will be no small gain, if I commit to writing all the details, that

they may not be lost and forgotten, being as they are very well worthy to be made known to posterity. I feel sure that this my work will tend to promote the best direction of the Church, and the improvement of its condition. And let no one run me down nor blame me as an accuser of sacred persons, who ought to have remembered how the archangel Michael dared not to bring a railing accusation against Lucifer, inasmuch as he had once been prince of the incorporeal spirits and his own superior. For I know that as it is right to praise virtue, so no less is it needful to blame vice and evil. Else, if men were not exposed and reproached for their evil deeds, they would have one motive the less for abstaining or desisting from them, and the consequence would be, that it would be all one to do ill or to do well.

CHAP. II. *Exposition concerning the following narrative.*

We have said above that God, for the good order and restraint and benefit of mankind, has instituted and given to all the seventy-two races and tongues the gift of despotism or monarchy. As for the Russian monarchy, predestined to protect and deliver us Greeks, and to take and renew Constantinople (according to the prophetic verses of Leo the philosopher about the russet or yellow people) when Constantine Palæologus VIII. and his consort Helena had lamentably lost Constantinople, the prince of Moscow (from which city and river the Russians are called Muscovites) John III. Basilides,[1] who was first gloriously proclaimed king from his having smitten and subdued the Tatars, who before held all the surrounding cities in subjection, had for his wife Sophia, the daughter of Thomas Palæologus despot of the Peloponnese. This John was succeeded by Theodore Joannides, who, to honour the holy Church of God, conceived the idea of raising the metropolitan see of Moscow to the supreme dignity of the patriarchate; that so the highest title of the priesthood might correspond with the highest title of empire. And it so falling out that the patriarch Jeremiah came from C.P. to Moscow in A.M. 7099 [really in A.M. 7097=A.D. 1588-1589] in quest

[1] The writer here confounds John III., who married Sophia and threw off the Tatar yoke, with John IV., grandson of Sophia, who gloriously subdued the Tatar kingdoms of Kazan and Astrachan, and who was the first solemnly proclaimed tsar, *i.e.* king or emperor, of Muscovy, and the father and predecessor of Theodore I.

of aid for the great church, after the scandals which had occurred in connection with Theoleptus, and the lamentable confiscation of the patriarchal church and residence (that of Pammakaristé), the said Jeremiah by his own sole act constituted and proclaimed Job, then metropolitan of Moscow, to be patriarch, as is written in the imperial Oustav (τακτικῷ κώδικι), although the two bishops who were with him, Dositheus of Monembasia and Arsenius of Elasson, did their best to restrain the patriarch of Constantinople from this act, and most strongly protested against it, saying, that [if done at all] it must needs be done by a synod, and proclaimed by consent of the other three patriarchs. It is worthy of notice too in what terms Meletius, who was then [who immediately afterwards became] patriarch of Alexandria, wrote on this same subject to the patriarch Jeremiah: 'I know, moreover,' he writes, 'that thou wert offended in the matter of the advancement of the metropolitan see of Moscow to the rank of a patriarchate. But thou knowest surely that this is not within the competence of a single patriarch (unless it be intended to make old Rome a pattern for the new), but of a synod only, and an œcumenical synod (*i.e.* of the Orthodox). For in this way hitherto the patriarchates have been established. So thy holiness ought to have obtained the consentient voices of the rest of thy brethren. For it behoves that all (as the fathers of the third council teach us) should know and decree what is done, when it is any common matter which is the subject of deliberation: and it is manifest that a patriarchal chair is not subject to any other chair, but to the Catholic Church (with which it is united and compacted by the confession of the one and immutable orthodox faith). Upon these principles I know thou wilt [eventually] act, and as having done what thou didst under compulsion, wilt upon reflection, both by word and missive, annul it. But [in the mean time] since our words do not move thee to any good, but only to perturbation and anger, and their consequences, I will spare your holiness my reproaches and myself trouble; and I pray that God may be gracious to us for the future in all things.'

Chap. III. *Embassy sent by the Tsar.*

Owing to these circumstances the Russian bishops represented to the tsar Theodore that the whole matter of the erection of the

patriarchate ought to have been determined with the suffrages of all; and therefore they prayed him to send an embassy to the emperor of the Hagarenes sultan Selim, to negotiate for the confirmation of peace, and also to the œcumenical patriarch Jeremiah; that he, being moved by direct request in usual form, should paternally mediate and arrange that the other three œcumenical patriarchs should come to Constantinople, and confirm by their synodical decree this great dignity and perfection of patriarchate for Muscovy. Theodore assented, and did this. And the patriarchs, having obtained permission, went to Constantinople; that is, Meletius of Alexandria (who was empowered to represent also the patriarch of Antioch Joachim) and Sophronius of Jerusalem, and nearly all the other members of the all-holy synod met at the residence of the œcumenical patriarch, and held a synod expressly and solely for the recognition and proclamation of the patriarch of Moscow. So all was done and completed happily, as may be seen in the patriarchal register (σελίδι): and it was decreed that the local bishops of Russia should have liberty to elect the patriarch of Muscovy and Russia according to their own desire and will, and that he should rank as patriarch after the patriarch of Jerusalem, fifth. For as Constantinople had obtained the privilege of precedency after the bishop of Rome, because it was the capital, from the divinely-inspired fathers of the councils of Constantinople and Chalcedon, so the four most holy œcumenical patriarchs and the rest of the synod of the bishops decreed that the great capital of Moscow, which is honoured with the emperor's residence and with the presence of the synclete, should obtain like and equal privileges with the former capitals, and be equally magnified in ecclesiastical matters. . . . Thus was elected the illustrious patriarch Philaret, who, though he was *consecrated* for the greater weight and authority by the patriarch of Jerusalem, Theophanes, then staying at Moscow, yet was in truth raised to the patriarchal chair by the voice of the emperor and the approval of the most reverend bishops, without the issue of any other patriarchal license. So too had been created before the patriarchs Hermogenes and Joasaph; so was created afterwards the patriarch Joseph; and so also Nicon; and the present patriarch Joasaph II., the concordant suffrages of the bishops of Muscovy and Russia having been presented to the most religious

emperor as the eldest son of the Church, and her protector and defender.

There was a suitableness in the way in which the jurisdictions of the œcumenical patriarchates were thus established in the different great divisions of the world. Asia had Antioch, where the first patriarchal chair was fixed by the presence of the most blessed Peter, the supremest prince of the Apostles, who, not without a divine providence, afterwards went to the elder Rome, which then had the sceptre of the world, and there having confirmed the word of the Gospel with signs and wonders, set up another throne to preside over the whole west. Egypt too shook off her old polytheistic idolatry, and receiving the light of the knowledge of God from the evangelist and apostle Mark, had a patriarchal chair of her own in the great city of Alexandria. Then after many years the Emperor Constantine raised Byzantium to be a worthy capital for the whole world; and that the city where the Lord's feet had trod, the mother of the Churches, might not seem left without due honour, it also was honoured with the patriarchal dignity, yet so as to have the last place, the holy fathers being herein divinely inspired with wisdom, that it might never be said nor thought (as might have been the case if the see of Jerusalem had held the primacy), that there was the authority and kingdom of Christ upon earth. It remained then, and was agreeable to these precedents, that the orthodox capital of Muscovy, as presiding over all the regions of the north, should be honoured and distinguished by the title of a patriarchate; and more especially at that point of time when, after the sting of the deceiving locust, after the irresistible and overwhelming force of the many-branched tyranny which had trodden down the four patriarchates of the world, it had pleased the Almighty to exalt conspicuously this newly-compacted empire of Russia for our consolation and support, that Christ's sheep of the *Eastern* Church might not altogether despair, as having no 'shepherd of peoples,' nor seeing any other such on the earth, nor knowing any orthodox emperor.

CHAP. IV. *Of the privileges of the different patriarchates.*

Since the Roman patriarch—*I know not how*—had been cut off from the rest, there was need of some other patriarch to be created in his stead, to fill up the mystical number of those

[five prophetical cities or] five heads which were to be found speaking the language of Canaan. So here there was appropriately introduced the patriarch of Russia, preserving unchanged the order of the rest: and the five patriarchal Churches may be compared to the five senses, or to the five mental energies . . . . Canon xxxiv. of the Apostles prescribes that the bishops of every nation are to distinguish him who is first among them, and reckon him as a head . . . There are three Churches not subject to any patriarch, the primates of which are called autocephalous, viz. those of Achrida (or Justiniana Prima), of Cyprus, and of the Iberians (or Georgians), to which some ignorantly add the archbishopric of Mount Sinai.

As for Iberia, it was once under Antioch, from the time when the patriarch Eustathius, after the first council of Nice, was sent thither to instruct them, after Nonna, who first taught the Iberians. And their bishops received successively their ordination from the patriarchs of Antioch. But in the time of the reign of David prince of the Iberians, the Curopalata, it came to pass that, their catholicos (*i.e.* their primate) having died, out of twelve monks, who were sent to Antioch to be consecrated bishops for all that region, ten were killed by the Hagarenes (or by them that were called of old Massagetæ, *i.e.* the Turks), and two only escaped and reached Antioch. These two related to Job, who was then patriarch (A.D. 822-853), all that had taken place, telling him also that for the future the journey would be very difficult and hazardous, and that on this account he should use some condescension with them. Whereupon the said patriarch, convoking all his local bishops, and stating to them the pressing necessity, synodically decreed that it should be allowed for the catholicos of Iberia to be ordained by the local bishops, without the issuing of any other patriarchal license; only that they should keep up the perpetual commemoration of the patriarchs of Antioch to all future time safe, whole, and inviolate; as Matthew Blastar in treating of rights and privileges (ch. ii.) witnesses. And the most exact Peter patriarch of Antioch (A.D. 1053), in his epistle to the bishop of Venice, who sought to be styled patriarch after the ruin of the city of Aquileia by the Goths, Vandals, and Lombards, writes, saying that, as there are five senses to which no sixth can be added, even so there cannot be more than five patriarchs: there is no room for a sixth. The

same determination of the synod held at Antioch respecting the Iberians was again confirmed by the patriarch Anastasius; and it is clearly noted in the canonical Catalogue of the Sees.

But the Church of Cyprus was honoured with independence by the decree of the third council, held at Ephesus. And canon viii. of the fifth council, held at Constantinople, forbids the patriarch of Antioch to assume the right of ordaining the bishops of Cyprus, which he was assuming on the ground, as it would seem, that the military commander in Cyprus had been used in former time to be sent thither by the dux of Antioch. And canon xxxiv. of the Quinisext synod in Trullo decrees that the former canon of the council of Ephesus in favour of the Church of Cyprus shall continue in full force. George Cedrenus relates that the relics of St. Barnabas having been discovered at Constantia in the reign of Zeno, with the gospel of St. Matthew translated by himself from the Hebrew into Greek on his breast, this was brought to the synod, and caused the fathers to honour as they did the Cypriote Church.

And in like manner by custom the privileges of the New Justiniana ought to be analogous to those of Constantinople; though it is true that Matthew Blastar remarks that it is difficult to make out whether this canon was ever actually in force. For novell cxxx. of Justinian has these words:

'We decree, according to the definitions of the holy synod, that the most holy Pope of the elder Rome is first of all the priests; and that the bishop of Constantinople has the second place, next after the apostolic throne of the elder Rome; and that of the rest the archbishop of Justiniana Prima, our native country, shall be preferred in honour, so as to have for ever under him the bishops of the provinces of Dacia, Mediterrania, and Daeria, Ripesia, Prævalia, and Kardania, and the upper Mysia; and that these bishops shall be consecrated by him; and that in these provinces subjected to him he shall *have the vicariate of the Apostolic throne*, according to the definition of the holy Pope Vigilius. The same right we have given also to the bishop of Carthage in Africa, from the time that God has restored to us this province.'

It is from a chrysobullon of Justinian that the privileges of the archbishop of Sinai also have originated. For he has such a document of that emperor, containing these words: 'My impe-

rial will is, to honour the superior of Mount Sinai for the time being with the highest honours;' and it appoints that he is to be reckoned third among such as enjoy extraordinary honours, and be equalled with them in all points, in processions, in sittings, standings, and meetings, and use robes like those of all such bishops as have in former or present time obtained such honours. The same is confirmed, or rather illustrated, by a document in an ancient Nomocanon to be seen in the library of the Isle of Chalke, which the patriarch Jeremiah inserted in his patriarchal and synodical letter, and which I also will here insert:

'At the time that Anastasius was patriarch of Antioch, in the reign of Justinian, when Jerusalem was finally honoured to be a patriarchate, in A.M. 6062 (A.D. 553), the patriarchs of Constantinople, Alexandria, and Antioch having met in synod, Anastasius patriarch of Antioch gave to the bishop of Jerusalem, of the metropolitan provinces subject to his see, two, viz. those of Cesarea of Palestine, and Scythopolis or Bashan; and in addition he detached from the metropolitan province of Tyre the see of Porphyropolis. Moreover they fixed (in the time of the patriarch Euthymius) the line of demarcation to the river which flows between Ptolemais and Mount Carmel of Zabulon. In like manner also from the metropolitan province of Bostra (τῆς Αὐσίτιδος) he detached four sees, viz. those of Gadira, Capitolias, Abilla, and Gava, and gave them to Jerusalem, and they set the border even unto the land called Ausitis. For before also in the fourth council held at Chalcedon—as may be seen in the seventh act—Maximus the patriarch of Antioch, by a composition entered into, and that with much jealousy and contention, had [allowed it to be] fixed synodically that the see of Jerusalem should have the three Palestines, and that of Antioch the two Phœnicias and Arabia, and have no occasion for contention for the future on account of this matter, the love of Christ being to both sides a power bringing them to agreement. And Apollinarius, the orthodox patriarch of Alexandria, likewise gave of the metropolitan provinces subject to his see Bostra of Arabia, and Petra, and six episcopal sees, viz. those of Gaza, Ascalon, Eleutheropolis, Pharan, Eleia, and Mount Sinai. But they made sure the throne of Mount Sinai, that no one should actually sit upon its holy synthronus (which to this present day is shut up), and made the border to be to the Red Sea. And thence

he who is canonically elected hegoumen and bishop of Mount Sinai by the patriarch of Jerusalem has to this day a clear and unquestionably legitimate institution. It is to be remarked, however, that there are three degrees or ranks of episcopal sees. For some of them are called *ὑπέρτιμος* (*i.e.* specially honoured), and their bishops are styled exarchs; as the metropolitan of Ephesus, who is styled *ὑπέρτιμος, καὶ ἔξαρχος* of all Asia; and the metropolitan of Thessalonica is *ὑπέρτιμος*, and exarch of all Thessaly, having also the place of . . . [legate of the bishop of Rome]. Others have the title of *ὑπέρτιμος* only, without that of exarch; as the prelate of Tiberiopolis or Varna, and the archbishop of Anchialus (for Anchialus was aforetime united to the see of Mesymbria). Some, and the very first, of the metropolitans, as the metropolitan of Cesarea in Cappadocia, are styled *ὑπέρτιμος τῶν ὑπερτίμων, καὶ ἔξαρχος πάσης τῆς Ἀνατολῆς*. In like manner the metropolitan of Heraclea is styled *πρόεδρος τῶν ὑπερτίμων*, and exarch of all Thrace and Macedonia. Whence it appears that the archbishop of Mount Sinai may indeed have a right to the title of *ὑπέρτιμος*, but not to that of exarch; and he is like other archbishops, and follows the rule of such as have been detached from their own metropolitans. For Mount Sinai was raised from being a simple bishopric to the title of an archbishopric; and so, properly, its prelate is to be called superior of Mount Sinai and bishop of the Holy Peak. And this is witnessed by the patriarch of C.P. Nicholas, who wrote to the illustrious Anastasius as 'hegoumen of Mount Sinai.' And if there have been at times instances in which the hegoumen-bishop of Sinai has been consecrated by some other patriarch than the patriarch of Jerusalem (as Sophronius, superior of Sinai, was consecrated archbishop by Joachim patriarch of Alexandria, and Lazarus by Gregory, also patriarch of Alexandria), still such rare exceptions do not make a rule. William the [Latin] archbishop of Tyre, in book xii. of his *History of the Crusade*, names the see of Mount Sinai as one of those which were subject to the patriarch of Jerusalem; and in the *τακτικὸν* (*i.e.* the official catalogue with the order of precedence) of the metropolitans and bishops of the patriarchal province of Jerusalem, the 'hegoumen and bishop,' as he is styled, of Mount Sinai is set down as the twenty-fourth see. It matters nothing that the entry has been cut out from the codex of Jerusalem, in order that the bishop of Sinai might

not seem to be subject to the patriarch of the Holy City. What has most weight [that way], and is more to the point than anything else, is this, that the name of the patriarch of Jerusalem is not mentioned in the services of the Church by the bishop of Sinai, though he is certainly not autocephalous. But what has been said is enough for the present, and by way of introduction.

We must now turn to the subject of our history, and to the patriarchate of Russia, which we have already said is ranked as the fifth. For though we said above, *contentiously as it were, and rhetorically,* that the patriarch of Russia bears the likeness of the patriarch of Rome, it is not therefore to be supposed that he has the place or order of the patriarch of Rome. Far from it. For this would be a contempt of the canon of the holy œcumenical synods, which forbid to change the ancient landmarks set by our fathers. It is enough, therefore, for the patriarch of Muscovy to be the head of the Russians, autocephalous like the rest of the patriarchs of the East, and nothing more. And as for the title of archbishop, *that is rather an indication that the see was once subject to a metropolitan, and came to be detached;* as Byzantium having been taken, as Photius relates, after a three years' siege in the reign of the Roman emperor Severus, and its walls destroyed, and the city itself subjected to Perinthus which is Heraclea, its bishops were in consequence ordained by the metropolitan of Heraclea, who still retains the privilege of consecrating the patriarch. And so the holy city of Jerusalem, or Ælia, was by the fifth council, in A.M. 6062 (A.D. 553), under Justinian, raised to be a patriarchate, when it had before been only a bishopric, subject to the metropolitan of Cæsarea of Palestine, as is mentioned in canon vii. of the first œcumenical synod of Nice. [And then he glosses this canon, as if it had been posterior to the fifth council, so as to reconcile it, thus: that, though Jerusalem is raised to be a patriarchate, Cæsarea is not therefore degraded to be a mere bishopric, but it keeps its rank as a metropolitan see under the patriarchal see of Jerusalem, and has the privilege, as before, of consecrating the bishop of Jerusalem, now become patriarch.] Armenia Major too was once under the chair of Antioch, but was afterwards detached in honour of its illuminator St. Gregory, and became autocephalous. And so the primate of Russia became autocephalous as the head of Russia, leaving,

however, at the same time undiminished its honour [*i.e.* its precedence] to the patriarchate of Constantinople, from which it has the gift of its exemption to the present day; whence we understand why the patriarchs of Constantinople and Jerusalem were called *archbishops*, viz. because they were once bishops, and were detached from their proper metropolitans.

Chap. V. *Entrance upon the subject.*

On the decease of Joseph patriarch of Moscow [in A.D. 1652] the man elected to succeed him was Nicon, who was then metropolitan of Novgorod, the first see in rank after the patriarchal. Before becoming patriarch he had *dissembled his true character*, acting a part, and being seemingly goodnatured, gentle, unwashed, unshod, no frequenter of the bath, and vastly celebrated for his love of learning, and for his love of the Greeks; yea, and even as if he were another Gregory the Divine, for his divinity, [especially his sermons]. But from the time that he obtained *his object*, and got to be at the head of all the rest, he threw off the mask, and showed himself plainly, what he had really been all along, a man of oak or stone, according to the old saying. . . . And as they say that nature will always come out, and that power and honours mostly change men for the worse, this saying, though it may sometimes not be so, was in Nicon's case at any rate truth itself. For he gradually evinced himself a great genius for intrigue, sharp to increase his own greatness, quick to avenge himself, and, in the words of St. Paul, 'reprobate for every good work;' strengthening his power in swelling and magnitude; heavy-handed, energetic, driving after every sort of badness and arrogance; treating with inhumanity his inferiors; a hireling, not a shepherd, as caring nothing that the sheep should perish; the slave of his pleasures, indulging himself in all manner of luxurious riot [σπαταλαις, *e.g.* in splendid robes, German works of art, new buildings, antiquities, books, curious arms, silks and stuffs, &c.], having been initiated from his early life [as having been a secular married priest] into secular licenses; and after having passed an interval in monastic life, *though far from attaching himself to it*, but ever occupied with softer works, erecting magnificent buildings for ostentation, multiplying his own possessions of productive villages, getting to himself the lordships of towns, ingratiating himself in the most

democratical way possible by the promptness and convenience of his numerous schemes, and by the quickness of his judgment; seeking rather to be renowned as a tutelary patron of cities, and a founder of monasteries, and to be styled Great Hossoudar (*μέγας αὐθέντης*), equipping himself rather with equalising imitations of the accompaniments of empire than satisfied with the concomitance of titles suitable for a patriarch, purposing and claiming to be a Nicetas [his original name in the world, *i.e.* a conqueror of others] and not a Nicon [*i.e.* one who, as an ascetic, is only conquering himself]. And yet the patriarch Metrophanes, who was of imperial origin (being of the lineage of the emperor Probus), and Theophylact, who was the son of the emperor Romanus, not to mention Chrysostom, who was son of Secundus a member of the synclete and commander of the army, and Theophilus patriarch of Alexandria, who was a relative of the empress Eudoxia, never dreamed of using such titles. And most properly. For undue honours are wont to excite arrogance. And hence the bishops of past and primitive times were named, and named themselves, *εὐτελεῖς*, that is, homely, obscure, plain, humble, servants, and mediocrities. And not only was this title of 'servant of the servants of God' taken by Gregory Dialogus, but Peter also patriarch of Antioch, in imitation of him, when writing to Dominic archbishop of Venice [of Grado] wrote himself 'the last of all the faithful, and servant of the servants of our Lord Jesus Christ.' And Michael patriarch of Alexandria styled himself 'the unprofitable servant of the servants of the Lord' in the letter which he wrote to the emperor Basil. For they remembered that, according to the Lord's words, he that exalteth himself shall be abased. And if canons ix. and x. of the synod of Carthage forbid the bishop of the first see to be called the chief (*ἄκρον*) of the priests or exarch, in order to preclude, as Balsamon supposes, that arrogance which from honour and precedence grows into power, and directly to enjoin humility and moderation, much more surely is one to be forbidden who calls himself 'Great Hossoudar' (that is, great lord). But all this by the way: we will now return to our subject.

Chap. VI. *Statement of the scandal which arose.*

Six years had passed, and Nicon was still patriarch, living the life of a Cyclops. For the days of his dignity were shortened

and brought to a close providentially, on account of his lawless acts and his daily base deeds. For the Most High not only sets limits to the life of every man, but also to his power; bringing us low and lifting us up, according to our work, as Basil the Great has it; and Chrysostom also, in speaking of the long-suffering of God, and the set term of years which he allowed for repentance before the flood burst upon the earth. And so, when the iniquities of Nicon were multiplied, and had swelled as a mountain to their full height, and cried aloud, even to heaven, He who disposes all things by weight and measure suddenly brought upon him at the fitting time the stroke of punishment suitable to what had preceded. What this was which had preceded, what its beginning, and what its complexion, I will now briefly relate.

In A.D. 1658 there came to Moscow Timouraz the king of the Iberians (*i. e.* of the Georgians), with a numerous suite and royal guards: and our emperor Alexis, among other attentions, ordered a splendid banquet to be prepared for his newly-arrived guest. And as the master of ceremonies at this great banquet he appointed the archon Bogdan, which is by appropriate interpretation Theodotus [Khitroff]. Now notice had been given that no one might enter that imperial banquet-hall except the members of the council, and such as were invited by name to the banquet, and they clad in splendid and gold dresses befitting the occasion. But Nicon, as not having had any invitation to the banquet, sent privately *to the banquet* one of his servants named Demetri, *to observe all*, and *come back and give him an account of it*. So he, *that he might not be recognised by them that sat at table*, went thither clad in mean and dirty clothes, unfit for that reception. And Bogdan, the master of the ceremonies, *pushed him slightly* with the open palm of his hand, and bade him get out and be gone. But the other ceased not to mutter and complain that he, the patriarch's servant, and sent there by him, should be so disgracefully turned out. However, master Demetri was obliged to leave the hall, which he did in great dudgeon, thinking that the most ill-starred day of his life, and hurried back to his lord to complain of Bogdan, who had thus openly insulted the patriarch.

On account of this *the next morning Nicon threatened to put forth a written excommunication against Bogdan*, who, as he said, had insulted the patriarchal office by striking his servant. But

the emperor, replying in gentle and conciliatory terms, tried to pacify the patriarch's indignation, *begging him to abstain from* any such most excessive and deliberate punishment, when the cause of offence was in reality but small; saying that otherwise he would cast a reproach on that day of the festivities, and cloud all the cheerfulness of the reception. But the patriarch *was deaf to these siren accents:* he was like the deaf adder to these imperial incantations; and his mind was wholly taken up with the study how to take some revenge to set off against this *beginning of skirmishing.* Shortly afterwards there was the festival of the Tunic of Christ, which the Russian Church is used to celebrate with great pomp on the tenth of July: and the emperor, *as having much to attend to just then,* did not go, as was usual, to the cathedral. A message was sent to him by the patriarch: but he excused himself on the ground that he was occupied with business of state, and so was unable to go down to the church. But Nicon, being naturally very suspicious, interpreted in his own mind the tsar's absenting himself to signify something else: and, taking this mere shadow of his own imagination as a second affront, he did an act which no man before him had ever exhibited on the stage of the world. This worthy device was as follows.

CHAP. VII. *His abdication.*

Nicon had come to the church to celebrate the holy liturgy; and after vesting himself in his patriarchal robes, and ending the whole ceremony of the celebration, he stood in the middle of the church, and began to belch forth from his belly publicly, in presence of all, words of madness, words which it was an absolute duty for him not to utter, if it had been possible for him to be silent. He showed that he had no idea of attending to that verse which says, Θυμὸν χαλίνου, μὴ φρένων ἔξω πέσῃς· (Bridle thine anger lest thou lose thy senses.) And so, after that his stale and rotten and *long* harangue, he attempted of his own will to divest himself of his patriarchal power, *imprecating on himself the greatest curses* if he should ever again return to his chair, or take the title of patriarch, or allow himself to be called patriarch by others. And as he spoke, he suited his action to his words. For, taking off his episcopal vestments one by one, he said as he took off each the words, 'I am no longer patriarch,' so that he had all but deposed and degraded himself. For the historian Nicetas

mentions among other ill-treatment suffered by the patriarch Ignatius, that after much contestation in words, and vehement contention and delay, without any law of justice, by the frantic use of mere force, they put upon this patriarch Ignatius tattered and filthy vestments, and after having so robed him in full sacerdotal attire disrobed him again back forwards: and there was a certain subdeacon named Procopius, in mind a fool, in life immoral, whom the patriarch shortly before had on this account degraded: and he, taking off first the omophorion, and then each of the other vestments, cried aloud at each Ἀνάξιος ('Unworthy')! In this only Ignatius differs from Nicon, that Nicon of his own freewill and resolution put off his episcopal vestments, but Ignatius was stripped of them by the force and violence of others. So then, when he had put off all, Nicon, instead of his white kamilauchion, took a black one, and put it on his head as an emblem of penitence. Also he left the pastoral staff, which was the original one of the first metropolitan of Moscow, St. Peter, ἀπαωρησάμενος, at the patriarchal chair, and so went forth from the church in humble guise [as degraded]. The emperor, on hearing of these extraordinary and irregular proceedings, was astounded: and afterwards he often said that he seemed to see a dream with his eyes open: and calling to him the first of all the archons, Alexis Niketich Troubetzkoy, he sent him out, at the head of other messengers, *to attempt to restore a good understanding*, to Nicon, with many entreaties that he would return to the patriarchate, and not put such a stigma at once upon the church and the state, to make them an object of mockery and sneers to all the peoples under heaven, from no other motive than manifest passion. But Nicon purposely worked himself up, and becoming still more fierce, utterly lost himself; and treating the mediatory mission of that nobleman as nothing, and showing no manner of respect or good feeling, he utterly rejected the friendliness expressed, expecting, as it seems, that the potent emperor, after having first sent others, would come himself to entreat him. And indeed our gentle and pacific sovereign would have gladly done this, if only he had foreseen any prospect of so obtaining the good result which he most greatly desired. However, knowing the inexorable and unchanging obstinacy of Nicon, and that he was swollen to a great pitch of arrogance, he let the man go to be quiet for a while, trusting that afterwards, by condescend-

ing letters and kind speeches, he should succeed in healing the untimely mortification of Nicon. There were in fact sent after this to and fro not a few conciliatory embassies (*προσεταιριζόμεναι*), mediations, entreaties, and letters: but these all availed nothing: the only result was, that he set himself against them, and fell foul of them more and more fiercely, not [letting them come and go] without fighting and raging against them, lifting up his neck on high, like a fiery and unmanageable horse, pretending that he was unwilling, *when he panted like a stag after it*, to resume the patriarchate.

CHAP. VIII. *A local synod.*

A long time passed, and all was full of confusion and interminable contention. A synod therefore was proclaimed; and the local bishops met; and having heard witnesses, and accurately examined into what had passed, and ascertained the monstrosity of the case, they synodically agreed and declared that they considered Nicon to be no longer patriarch, and that none of the said bishops should any more give him the name or title of patriarch, or kiss his hand according to the custom; and if any bishop should contravene this decree, that he should incur canonical censures and penalties; as may be seen in their synodical codex, subscribed by the bishops and by the other heads of the clergy. The main point of the synodical determination itself was the fact of Nicon's own voluntary and absolute abdication. For there is a saying, that there is no snare to take a man like his own lips; and whosoever is taken and caught by the words of his own mouth is held tight by bonds which cannot be loosed, and can in no way escape, but must absolutely abide and stand by all that he has voluntarily uttered. Wherefore also, when such an one is convicted of having transgressed, his just recompense awaits him, and he can no longer evade the merited punishment of his irrevocable recklessness. Martyrius patriarch of Antioch once in times past abdicated the government of his disobedient and ill-advised people, and left them, having kept blameless his own episcopal dignity: and Narcissus patriarch of Jerusalem, having been calumniated by certain malicious people, and after a time having returned to Jerusalem, was most highly honoured by Gordianus, who meanwhile had succeeded to his chair. But no one, after having once abdicated, and in spite of

having done so, unless he were a second time canonically invited to it, has ever remounted his throne merely of his own will. Else he would be, and would justly be called, an invader, if he ventured upon anything of the kind arbitrarily, as acting inconsistently with his own previous declaration. Gregory the Theologian, when on account of certain jealousies he had left the chair of Constantinople, went to the palace and asked as a favour the permission of the emperor Theodosius, addressing him in these words: 'For all the good thou hast done to the Church, O emperor, may Christ reward thee in the day of just retribution: and now refuse me not the request I am going to make. I beseech thee let me be released from my cares. This gift I ask of thee; this last favour I hope thou wilt grant me.' Surprised at his words, the emperor and the members of the council, as having a great reverence for him, and regret to lose him, could scarce bring themselves to let him depart with permission to retire. However, they did. But Nicon neither went to the palace, though he was in the habit of being there very frequently on account of many hair-splittings, nor communicated his inward intention to his own bishops; but did quite alone what he did so unreservedly and strangely, and what he afterwards repented of, when he could no longer undo it. And hence we see that Nicon's abdication was not a nullity, nor incapable of being taken hold of against him, because it was only verbal; seeing that the patriarch Narcissus also of Jerusalem, and Martyrius of Antioch, and Gregory of Constantinople, abdicated their sees only verbally, and yet their acts had a solid and most abiding validity with all. I will say something which may seem strong, viz. that the unwritten has even a more certain validity than the written abdication. For the one a man may subscribe under compulsion; as Tryphon patriarch of Constantinople, once being ensnared by the metropolitan of Cesarea, abdicated contrary to his own will. Also it is commonly reported that afterwards he [Nicon] subscribed himself as merely a bishop, without a see. An abdication made in presence of the Church, though unwritten, no lapse of time could ever obliterate, seeing that he had the sun to witness what he did, and the surrounding people to denounce for ever the truth. Of a truth the words of divinely-delivered tradition, as says the Areopagite, are of the greatest weight. Wherefore also the divine apostles delivered many things by secret revela-

tion to them that were perfect and fully initiated: as also St. Paul, writing to the Thessalonians, bids them to hold fast what they had heard, whether by word or by epistle. And to Timothy he testifies that he had delivered to him a deposit in a mystery, that is, the secret tradition, according to the paraphrase of Pachymeres. In like manner, then, the unwritten abdication, being a manifest tradition, and made known to the multitude, and a sort of notorious pledge, has the utmost force for all men of understanding, who know that all the time before Moses men were not taught by letters and books, but conversed mouth to mouth, and learned the will of God through the divine illumination, as Theophylact archbishop of Bulgaria makes clear in the introduction to his Commentary. Even the throwing-off of the omophorion alone would have abundantly sufficed to constitute a perfect abdication; for we find it recorded that Peter patriarch of Alexandria, when in the prison, put off his omophorion, and sent it to his successor Achillas, in token of a regular abdication: so that the said omophorion answered at once to both of them both these purposes, of being for the one a proof of clear abdication, and for the other a manifestation declaratory of his inthronement and succession. And Metrophanes again, the most clear-sighted bishop, whom Constantine the Great acknowledged as his spiritual father, when very aged and worn with sickness, went down with his bishops to the church, and proclaimed the presbyter Alexander bishop and successor to his own chair: on which the people with one voice, together with the emperor himself, for several hours kept crying Ἄξιος ('He is worthy')! Then he put away his omophorion on to the holy table, charging that it should be kept for his successor, and predicting that the man would be there [to claim it] before long: and he came in fact the seventh day after his death, he having lived 106 years, as Photius in his *Bibliotheca* relates. But the imprudent Nicon not only put off his omophorion, the badge of the episcopal dignity, but openly and of his own free will cast off all his sacerdotal vestments; a thing the like to which had never been done from the beginning, nor heard of. I am not ignorant of what is practised in Palestine, and all the rest of the quarter of the East, namely, that whenever any ecclesiastical person seeks to contract a second marriage, such an one is vested in all his sacred attire and set in the middle of the church (so says the patriarch Mele-

tius, writing to the people of Castron in Crete about priests contracting a second marriage), in the midst of the congregation, the bishop sitting in his chair; and then, while they sing 'To-day Judas deserts his Master, and admits the devil,' he is divested one by one of all his sacred vestments, while the priests who divest him and the congregation who stand round cry, as each article is taken off, 'Ἀνάξιος ('He is unworthy')! Then, as having lost the beauty and grace of priesthood, and having removed to another place, he is allowed to marry again. Nicon, then, suffered [or inflicted upon himself] what is customary for digamists, without understanding the great disgrace and reproach which would thence accrue to him, and which he was fixing spontaneously upon himself, and upon all the episcopal order: (for the offences of priests are judged a common disgrace to all their order).

Chap. IX. *Contumacy of Nicon towards the synod.*

But Nicon, being inflated with an idea of his own wisdom, contemptuously rejected the acts of this synod, as no better than the dirt-houses built by children on the light sand; and he was even wont to call this meeting a synagogue, or conciliabulum, not considering that he himself, only a little before, had held the place of chief in *this same* synagogue. The things in it which displeased him, and with which he found fault, were three; viz. first, that he himself was not personally present to defend himself, but was condemned unheard in his absence; and he quotes that saying in the Gospel of St. John, 'Doth our law condemn any man without first hearing him, and knowing what he doeth?' secondly, that he was condemned by those whom he had himself consecrated to be bishops, or, as he might say, by his own children, whose father he was; thirdly, that, contrary to the canons and the ecclesiastical constitutions, this synod was convoked *by the emperor alone*, and in no wise by a patriarch, or by the Pope of Rome, according to the synod of Sardica. For these reasons he continued freely to ordain, and openly celebrated the liturgy, and did all just as he had done before, as openly *warring with the emperor*, and contending against all the sacred synod, and was manifestly meditating, even on foot, to run to the recovery of his chair.

But these objections, though a thousand times put forward,

were refuted; and below they shall be shown by us to be mere cobwebs, or rather gapings. But for the present it will be enough to add only, that there is no need of any testimony or formal apology where the proofs speak for themselves distinctly and cry aloud. There was no occasion, then, for Nicon to be summoned to make his defence respecting what he had done himself spontaneously, and about which he could have no defence to make. For if he did not wish to abdicate, who obliged him to leave the patriarchal chair? but being in full freedom, and his own master, he did what he did, and was his own sole and only enemy, to hurt himself. And the passage which he alleged from the Gospel could avail him nothing, having another sense, viz. that it is not right to condemn a man off-hand without knowing his cause, but that there is need of very careful examination and of full knowledge, so that the judges may know what they ought to do and decide, as Theophylact interprets it. Also, what he says respecting the bishops who condemned him in their synodical meetings is a great mockery of truth: for it was not the man Nicon himself, but the Holy Ghost, who ordained them, and who ordains all of us from above, from heaven. Wherefore Paul, as is related in the Acts of the Apostles, says (ch. xix.): 'Take heed unto yourselves, and unto all the flock in which the Holy Ghost hath made us bishops.' The Spirit, then, and not any man, makes the bishops: the Spirit is the efficient cause, the man is only his instrument. Wherefore also the relation of ordainer does not exist strictly and in itself, but only in human parlance. Though Nicon, therefore, may be spoken of as the senior of them that were ordained bishops by him, both in respect of his act in ordaining them and in respect of the ministry, still they are all equally fellow-brethren, fellow-ministers, fellow-bishops. And as for the synod, and the question who has a right to convoke it, it is a long question, and a very old one: nevertheless, as the election of the bishops of old was made by the people, who lifted up their hands and suggested aloud the names they favoured, though the act of ordination and the sacramental ceremony was performed by the bishops who laid their hands on the persons elected, so also in like manner the convocation of the synod *belonged originally to the sovereign*, who convoked and brought together the bishops; but the confirmation of the things decreed in the synod belonged to the bishops who sat in it and who go-

verned the churches (that I may use the words of Socrates, in book ii. of his Eccl. Hist.). Nevertheless the emperors also subscribed the decrees of the synods, to show that they assented to them, and as confirming or authenticating the records of them. And so the fathers of the second œcumenical synod earnestly besought Theodosius the Great to confirm what they had synodically decreed, for the universal accrediting and corroborating of the same.

Chap. X. *Doubt of the synod.*

Also respecting the liturgy, whether Nicon should celebrate or not, there was much difference of opinion among the bishops then assembled; some affirming that he might, others strenuously denying this. The greater number, however, and especially our Romaic bishops then at Moscow, Parthenius of Thebes, Cyril of Andros, and Nectarius of Pogoniane, as following more closely the holy canons, said that Nicon ought by no means to touch the awful mysteries, nor venture to celebrate, as being no longer regularly capable, after he had once for all and absolutely abdicated and foresworn his episcopal character. For if canon xvi. of the synod called δευτεροπρώτη (the First and Second), delivers to us, and absolutely decrees, that a bishop absenting himself for more than six months from his diocese, and not prevented from returning by any plea of necessity, is at once to be deprived of his see, *and of the priesthood*, much more surely is one who has once abdicated the patriarchal dignity, and stripped himself of all the insignia of the episcopate in the church, to be forbidden to perform the divine liturgy, the highest act of divine service, the mystery of mysteries. For, so far as he could, he had deserted and left altogether to the wolves that sacred flock which had been committed to his charge by Christ the chief shepherd, *despising the care of it*. It is senseless certainly, and profane, for any one to abdicate the troublesome and laborious part of primacy, but to hold and claim to retain all that carries with it honour and reverence, making ease his object, rather than the care of souls. This is confirmed by St. Cyril in chap. iii. of his Epistle to Domnus: for he says that for the stewards of the mysteries to abdicate their churches is not approved by the canons and laws of the Church: for if they are worthy to celebrate, they ought not to abdicate their office; and if they are unworthy, still

such ought not to be allowed to retire by abdication; but upon conviction and proof of their offences they should be deprived. The same subject is enlarged upon also by can. iii. of Dionysius. If, then, the canons decree excommunication against such as, being called to preside over the people, refuse to comply, who that has sense would admit the ease-seeking abdication of those who are already established in office, and not rather punish them, as they merit, with the utmost severity; especially as the name of the episcopate is significative of act and energy, which, if any one have voluntarily shaken off from him, he has thereby lost also the thing itself, that is, the name. And if he be not such as to be rightly called a *bishop* (an overseer), how shall he claim the *priesthood?* or how shall he be called a hierarch who has no clergy under him, nor is a ruler of clerks? And if a man have not properly any name of hierarchy, certainly he must be far from having a right to the exercise of hierarchical functions or powers. He who has no share in the name can never be supposed to have a claim to the thing. An act of abdication, then, is not to be admitted unless the person abdicating confess himself to be unworthy of the priesthood; but this being demonstrated, then in that case, on his abdication, the person abdicating will lose simultaneously all sacerdotal rank. Read, dear reader, Matthew Blastar's 28th chapter about abdication, where you will find much that is to the point.

Chap. XI. *Condescension of the Emperor.*

But our most intelligent sovereign Alexis—in fact, as in name, a man of God[2]—thought that it was indispensable to use some condescension and economy, labouring for peace and anxiously seeking for it, according to his title of Most Serene or Calm, as he knew too well the unhappy contentiousness of Nicon, and his haughtiness and obstinacy. And there was found a convenient precedent for condescension in the letter of the third œcumenical synod to the Pamphylians, respecting the case of a certain bishop named Eustathius, who under certain circumstances of difficulty had, of pusillanimity and desire of ease, resigned by a written act his bishopric, to which another bishop had already been consecrated. This Eustathius, having changed his mind,

[2] His patron saint, from whom he was named, being called 'Alexis, the man of God.'

came with tears into the holy synod, not reclaiming his church, nor disputing the right of its occupant, but only begging to be allowed to have the name and honour of a bishop. So the fathers, moved by the tears of Eustathius, and fearing lest any harm should befall him of his excessive grief, judged it right that he should have the name and honour and communion of a bishop, *i.e.* that he should enter within the sanctuary to communicate, but should not ordain unless permitted to do so by the local bishop. Wherefore, as those holy fathers in time past used a certain economy or condescension, and allowed the said Eustathius to celebrate, with the knowledge and permission of the local bishop, and occasionally to ordain, with the like permission, so the Russian bishops were disposed to allow Nicon to celebrate, and occasionally to ordain—only in his own monastery, in a simple way—till such time as there should be a new patriarch created, which they hoped and expected would be almost immediately, not having the least idea—far, very far, were they from it—what a length of days and years was to pass first. But experience, the universal instructress, showed clearly that the above-mentioned œcumenical precedent for condescension was not good to be followed continually, or in the case of all persons. For, if Nicon had been made to remain without executing any sacred functions, he would not afterwards have been so audacious as he showed himself, but would have been humbled, and would have had leisure to think of his own soul, and to bewail his former errors. But as it was, having simply *permission* to officiate, he began afterwards openly to excommunicate and to anathematise individuals; and on one occasion in particular—on the first Sunday of Lent, called Orthodox Sunday—even bishops, especially Pitirim the metropolitan of Kroutitz, and all the rest that he knew to be his opponents and antagonists, making of his newly-founded monastery a complete patriarchal residence, where he did, while he worked [at its erection], whatsoever he pleased.

CHAP. XII. *Arrival of the Metropolitan of Gaza.*

Things being in this state, when five years [current, from 10th July A.D. 1658, really not four years complete] had now elapsed since Nicon's abdication, there came to Moscow, *for his own purposes, of his own will* [see above, p. 10], Paisius metropolitan of Gaza. He arrived in A.D. 1662, on the 30th day of the

paschal festival [M. 28th Apr.]; and on the 1st of April [May] in the cathedral first saw the most radiant face of the most serene emperor Kyr Kyr Alexis Michaelovich. Nicon heard of the arrival of this metropolitan of Gaza, and sent an instruction to Arsenius[3] the monk, who was his confidential agent, to pay a visit of salutation in his name to the metropolitan of Gaza. And the salutation was in this form: 'The arrival of thee Paisius metropolitan of Gaza, and his brother in the Holy Ghost, is a matter of great joy to Nicon, heretofore patriarch of Moscow; and he has great hopes that through thy help all shall be perfect peace, so that the partition wall of enmity may be broken down, which has strangely and unnaturally grown up between the patriarch and the emperor.' The metropolitan of Gaza, *having no knowledge as yet* enabling him to detect what was under the surface of the man, received the words of salutation civilly; and after answering them, without committing himself, with properly-worded politenesses, allowed the bearer of the patriarchal compliments to depart with his own compliments in return. But Nicon, being far from satisfied with the result of Arsenius' mission, sent to the metropolitan of Gaza a friendly letter written in the Slavonic tongue (Σλοβαϊστὶ), in which he detailed pathetically all that he had suffered. This patriarchal letter was translated by the most learned διδάσκαλος Epiphanius [Slavenetsky] into Latin; and a copy of it is preserved *in the imperial archives* for a record for ever. It would be tedious to insert it here; especially as all its contents appear from the answer made to it by the metropolitan of Gaza, an answer which he wrote *not without the imperial command*. This answer was as follows:

[We, however, will here first insert the letter of Nicon:

Nicon, by the grace of God Patriarch, to the most reverend Paisius Metropolitan of Gaza, sends greeting in the Holy Ghost his gracious benediction. [*Written before the 12th July*, A.D. 1662.]

We are not ignorant, by the mercy of God, what has moved thine episcopal reverence to write to the tsar's majesty of the present urgent matter; nevertheless, we will write to thee some better information as to the facts themselves, their nature, and the way in which they have occurred from the beginning, that you may know what has taken place in all my tribulations from

[3] See above, p. 5 and 8.

that time when they first began to be put upon me, without any manner of controversy or contradiction.

It pleased the grace of the Holy Ghost that our humility should be placed in the patriarchal chair, in conformity with the constitution given by the most holy patriarchs (and we have here a copy of it, written out as it was confirmed by the hands of the four most holy œcumenical patriarchs, and of other most rev. metropolitans archbishops and bishops, and by their seals, in the time of the tsar Theodore Ivanovich, &c.). And when we had sat in the patriarchal chair of Moscow six years, and were in the councils serviceable and agreeable to our most gracious tsar, *though not in all things*, that is [not] in [respect of] the constitution of the Church, [since we maintained] that our holy mother the Church had received supreme and independent authority in ecclesiastical causes, according to the tradition of the holy apostles and of the holy fathers of the seven councils, and of other most gracious emperors (in the Sl. tsars), the tsar's majesty took to himself [supreme] authority to judge both ourselves and others our most rev. metropolitans, archbishops, and bishops, monasteries, archimandrites, hegoumens, consecrated religious men and women, and all the order of the clergy. But, what is more than all assertion or proof, you yourself at Moscow see with your own eyes what danger and tyrannical devastation *is approaching* for the Church, and how upon ukases from the tsar there are made compulsorily archimandrites and hegoumens, popes, deacons, constitutions, and admonitions; inasmuch as both we ourselves and the whole order of the episcopate are by ukaz of the tsar subjected to the jurisdiction of lay people.

On the 15th of June in the past year 7166 [1658] the tsar made a great entertainment for a certain king of Georgia, at whose coming to the tsar's majesty one of the tsar's nobles struck our strapchi. And when it was said to him, 'This is the patriarch's strapchi, whom thou oughtest not to strike,' the same servant of the tsar repeated the blow with greater force, and spake words of abuse, saying, 'Why are we so much to respect the patriarch?' And I made a representation of what had been done by a letter in my own hand, which I sent to the tsar's majesty, that he should cause the proper inquiry to be made, and justice to be done. And the tsar's majesty would not do this; but he wrote with his own hand that he intended to see

me. But he did not see me. On the second day he became very angry.[4] And on the 8th of July I celebrated divine service in presence of the miraculous icon of our Lady of Kazan, which has a church in Moscow in the great street: and on that day the tsar came neither to the vigil service nor to the liturgy, [though it was customary that he should do so], in consequence of his being incensed against me. And on the 10th day of the same month, on the festival of the Tunic of our Lord, sent from Persia to Moscow, on which day likewise it is customary for the tsar to attend the vigil service and the paráclesis, I sent to inquire whether the tsar's majesty was coming to the vigil. And he would not come to it: but he sent a certain prince of his suite [Youry Romodanofsky] to my cell with many unprofitable words, and with disrespect. And we, when we had heard that abuse, thought it over, and determined to 'give place to wrath.' And so in fact we did, since the tsar's authority has engrossed everything, and we are accounted for nothing. Having finished the divine liturgy *in the usual manner*, we *delivered our testimony of this* in the holy church before God, and before all the world, and sent to the tsar's majesty the kliuchar to advertise him of our departure,[5] telling him that we had not done, nor were doing, any hurt or prejudice whatever to the Church of God, but went away on account of his unreasonable wrath, 'doing according to the words of the gospel, "when they persecute you in one city, flee into another;" and, "whoever receives you not, and hearkens not to your words, when ye go out from that house or from that city, shake off the dust from your feet for a testimony against them." And now I, going forth from this your city, shake off from my feet and leave to you the dust which cleaves to them.' And the tsar's majesty sent to the church a certain nobleman with the same words of disrespect as before. Therefore we, taking up the song of holy David, 'Lo, I fled, and escaped, and abode in the desert,' 'I waited for God my saviour,' went forth, and remained here a year and two months, suffering privations; and we went hence to another

[4] In another MS. 'on which account I was angry.' But Nicon throughout, and in answer to the tsar's own question, said that it was the *tsar's wrath against him* which moved him to leave Moscow; so that this cannot be unmentioned here. Whether he was displeased himself at this second evasion has nothing to do with Nicon's statement of his own case.

[5] This was in his letter only, as then written by him and sent to the tsar.

monastery, and again from it to a third, which is upon the sea, and in that haven we abode a year.

Then the tsar convoked the different authorities living here [under his rule in Russia]; and of the circumstances related above concerning our departure he told them nothing. But he procured that false depositions should be written down from the lips of certain men living in the palace; and others with severe threats he commanded to say of me that I had voluntarily abdicated my chair. To this end the tsar gave gifts to bishops, archimandrites, and hegoumens, that they should subscribe with their hands that we should be no longer patriarch [*i.e.* should be treated as if deposed]. And they submitted themselves to the tsar's will according to his ukaz, without having in any way examined into the opposite side; and, without having asked for any explanation or answer, for what reason I had gone away, passed a judgment on me which was irregular; and all subscribed with their hands against me; contrary to the tradition of the holy fathers, and to canon xvi. of the council called the First and Second, which enacts thus: 'If any bishop departs from his diocese, and lives in some other place above six months, not being kept by imperial command, nor in obedience to the patriarch, nor being sick and unable to move, such a one is to be deprived by common consent of his episcopal rank and authority.' But my departure was not of any such kind; but is shown to have been made according to the words of the gospel, in which Jesus Christ himself is related at divers times to have withdrawn from the malice of Herod and of the Jews; both secretly withdrawing himself, and openly going away from them. So also did the apostles. For Paul went away from Damascus, and Peter from the prison. Others in like manner withdrew from authorities; as Gregory the Divine and Athanasius the Great openly withdrew from tyrannical persecutions. So too those [very] bishops themselves who made charges against me contrary to that tradition are worthy of deposition, since they abode more than six months in Moscow when convoked together against me, though their duty was not to have listened to the tsar, nor to have assembled without our consent and permission, according to their written engagement which was read by them in the holy church at their election before us, and before the tsar, and before all the world, that they 'will not [contrary to the canons]

obey the tsar or his ukaz, even though he were to threaten them with death.' But they, having been almost all of them consecrated by me, registered not against themselves the tradition of the First and Second council above mentioned, which in its canons xiii. xiv. and xv. has the following: 'If any pope, or bishop, or metropolitan, dares to separate himself from the unity of the most holy patriarch, and does not name him according to the rule in the celebration of the holy mysteries, but, before a synod has deliberated, and the act of his condemnation has been read, anticipates his deposition, such a one the holy synod decrees is to be stripped of all sacerdotal honour.' Nor did they register against themselves the tradition of the synod of Sardica (canon xix.): 'If any bishop be deposed without cause, by violence, or contrary to reason, as if either for the confession of the Catholic Church, or for justice itself, and is forced to suffer injustice, he, as being a true [pastor] and blameless, may abide in another city, as long as may be necessary, till he is able to return and obtain satisfaction for the wrong done to him.' But we did not go away into any other dioceses or flocks during all this time, but have been living within our own flock and in our own diocese of Moscow, though not long ago we heard that a great persecution was fiercely threatened us from the tsar's majesty, and this was reported to us by the tsar's command by Herodion Matveëvich Streshneff, the tsar's okolnik, saying that the tsar's majesty would endure [the present state of things] no longer. But we are conscious of no kind of fault towards the tsar, except for this, that we write and speak blaming his injustice, in that he has reduced the holy monasteries of God to great poverty, and has profaned the churches of God by his violent hand. And he has been moved to wrath against us because his doing thus is displeasing to us. And he, without our episcopal blessing [or consent], takes from the holy churches and monasteries their sacred maintenances and their lands: and whatever he thus takes from them he, without any episcopal judgment and permission, forcibly subjects to his own power. And, as I see myself in Moscow, without any episcopal election, bishops and archimandrites are ordained merely upon his command, and are sent according to his will and discretion. And, as I myself see, both we ourselves and all the synod of the bishops are put under the jurisdiction of people of no [ecclesiastical] character: and that court [of theirs]

is called the Monastery Court. And those very men whom we, by the power given us by the Holy Ghost, have bound, the tsar looses, and, regarding our bond and curse as nothing, bids them to be absolved, and unites himself with them, and goes to prayer with them, transgressing canons x. and xi. of the Apostles. But for that I anathematised the metropolitan of Kroutitz and Simeon Streshneff, a member of the tsar's council, I did this not without just cause. Because in the first year after our departure we heard that the metropolitan of Kroutitz had, like the cursed Reuben, defiled his father's bed, and cast reproach on him, when, in celebrating the festival of Palm Sunday, he, without any scruple, sat on the seat of his father before all the world, with insult to the name of his father. But in the gospel it is written that Christ alone sat on that ass, and never bade his apostles to do so likewise. But to all of them he gave commandment thus, saying: 'Heal the sick; cleanse the lepers; raise the dead; cast out devils; wash one another's feet. I am hungry, give ye me to eat; I am thirsty, give ye me to drink;' &c. But none of these things did he do; but he did what was contrary to the traditions, following only the ukaz of the tsar. Thus, without any synod, contrary to all former right and law, he ordained a bishop to a see belonging to the patriarchate of Constantinople, in the province of Kieff. And at the time of this ordination he sat in the patriarchal place. And now he governs three dioceses, the patriarchal, that of Souzdal, and his own of Kroutitz, these many years past. But his own diocese he has never so much as once seen since he was ordained to it. Of other malicious insults and unjust reproaches which we have met with we will not go on to write. You yourself, as your ears are open, will hear the stories which are circulated by many in the world. Pray to God for us, that we may be restored to health: for we are in the greatest pain and suffering, caused by the malice of a certain wicked hierodiacon of the metropolitan of Kroutitz, who, by his suggestion, privily gave us a drink drugged with a deadly poison, to carry us off. But the justice of God delivered us from that deadly poison, according to the scripture: 'If ye drink any deadly thing, it shall not hurt you.' But for my sins God allowed it to be taken up into my body, and so we are now tortured by its effects, and we think that we cannot live much longer. The member of the council, Simeon Streshneff, has been anathe-

matised by us for this, that he taught a certain dog like himself to give the blessing with his fore-paws, as Christ at his ascension blessed his disciples, lifting up his two hands. Three monks I anathematised for this, that they revile the holy confession of the orthodox faith which was sent to us from the most holy Paisius, then patriarch of Constantinople; and for this also, that, not having faith in the most holy liturgy and the divine mysteries, they make societies, contrary to that which we have enacted with the council, and with the blessing of our brother the most holy œcumenical patriarch [*i.e.* the patriarch of C.P.], because we in our diocese would never allow anything to be either added or taken away from the Church, contrary to the canons of the holy apostles and the holy œcumenical synods. Your reverence writes about 'certain books of the tsar's majesty, which were collected from many countries, and now lie shut up, unread and neglected.' For the obtaining of those books it was not the tsar's will, but my care that did what was done. They have been carried away hence to our more distant monasteries. Farewell: and do not forget us in thy holy prayers.]

Chap. XIII. *Answer of Paisius to the letter of Nicon.*

To Nicon, heretofore the most blessed and most learned Kyr Kyr patriarch of Moscow and Russia, the humble Paisius metropolitan of Gaza does due obeisance.

Thou hast struck us to the heart with one of thy apologetical epistles, most venerable patriarch, and hast so charmed me, that thy golden epistle is as an amulet to hang around my neck (*νηπενθές τ' ἄχολόν τε κακῶν ἐπίληθον ἁπάντων*), as a charm of peace, making one to forget all evils. For it contained the drama of thy struggles and of all thy sufferings in the most attractive style; *for which may the God of retribution repay thee with a worthy reward in the* glorious day of retribution. For the Lord says of them that suffer persecution for righteousness' sake that theirs is the kingdom of heaven, signifying by the word righteousness (or justice) all virtue, which they who hunger and thirst after here shall there be filled with. But, finding myself to be standing between two parties of combatants, I am at a loss to which side to turn; as no man can serve two masters: for either he will hate the one, and love the other, or he will cleave to the one, and despise the other. The bishop of Hippo, as we know, when

between two icons [of Christ and the B. Virgin], cried out, not without tears, in his prayer: 'Which way to turn I know not. From the icon of the Mother I am fed with milk; and from the side of the Lord I am both fed and washed.' A soldier once said to the Emperor Hadrian, 'My horse carries me, *but the Emperor feeds me.*' I, without any flattery, will say, Alexis and Nicon, the monarch and the patriarch; the one of them day by day bestows his grace upon me, the other both prays for and blesses me. It shall be another Theophilus of Alexandria to judge between them, and to bring them to amity, cutting off the hand of the one and the tongue of the other, in their representative waxen images.

Thus, if it had been some time earlier, I *might have* preluded, and *might have been* ambitious to be decorated, like Theophilus, with a gold mitre and double epitrachelion by them jointly, in reward for negotiating a treaty of peace between them. But since the Eris has cast the apple of strife with the inscription, 'Let it be given to the stronger' (*Detur fortiori*, τῷ κρείττονι), and has fled, she has occasioned a thousand scandals, and indeed has opened the very box of Pandora, and has let loose a swarm of mischiefs on this capital. Let us probe the first sources of this evil plethora. For if these can be purged away, we may hope to obtain more easily and more speedily a complete cure. The Creator of all things brought all the beasts of the field and all the fowls of the air to Adam to be named. It may be asked why he did not let him who named all the other creatures *give* a name also to *himself*? and the wise reply that hereby he cut up by the roots the passion of self-love. For if our first ancestor had been allowed to name himself, he would not have named himself from the clods, or Earthy (for this is the meaning of the word *Adam*), but he would have aspired, we may imagine, to some splendid titles and swelling designations, such as Proto-nobilissimo-panupertatos, above his earthly nature. The true root of mischief, and the stronghold of evils, is self-love, which blinds the divine mind, and blocks up the gates of the senses. For from the time that thy beatitude *received* the title of Great Hossoudar, an epithet of preëminence which encircles the head of the emperor as with a fair diadem, the tares have sprung up abundantly, running up from the ground. And I have been astonished—yea, by truth, which is dear to me—that thou shouldest magnify thy-

self with this unusual title, well knowing what great scandals were occasioned by the title 'Œcumenical' between John the Faster and Gregory Dialogus; though the œcumenical patriarch (*i.e.* the patriarch of C.P.) insisted so to be styled unquestionably on the ground of his relation to the œcumenical emperor, who held the power of the whole *οἰκουμένη*, or inhabited world. For, as Homer sings, *οὐκ ἀγαθὸν πολυκοιρανίη· εἷς κοίρανος ἔστω, εἷς βασιλεύς* (Many rulers are not a good thing: let there be one ruler, one king); like as there is one God, and one sun among the planets. So Alexander replied, when Darius, the Persian king, asked to halve the empire with him.

Farther, there has been an access of great mischiefs in the baneful polity of that out-of-the-way corner [Voskresensk], which, after remaining uninhabited for many years and desolate, found a pretext for being colonised: on account of which monastery also populous villages of the boyars have been made desolate, and all these subsequent calamities have ensued, murders, feuds, plunderings, and intestine fightings.

I know that thy most reverend eminence looks to a right purpose and end. Nevertheless, 'let what is good be done also in a good way,' said *Synesius*, a man of understanding in truth as in name. And before him Gregory the Theologian had said, 'Good is not good, unless it be also done in a good way.' 'Woe unto him,' says the Truth itself, 'by whom the offences shall have come!' Thou thinkest that thou blamest justly the tsar on account of the blow given to thy servant, who, thou sayest, represented the patriarchal dignity. But perchance this is not really so. For though it be true that the honour of the icon passes to the original, still, O most blessed patriarch, not every servant of a king represents the image of the king; nor therefore does every servant of a patriarch represent the patriarch. And so, consequently, neither does every slight dishonour put upon a servant constitute an insult to the patriarch or the king, any more than every honour done to a king's servant is at once and necessarily to be referred to the king himself. I well know that Theodosius the Great was vehemently incensed against the Thessalonians for the insult offered to a statue; but then that statue was one of his own sister: as also the neglect of the due honour to a certain king's son moved the king his father to wrath, which was noticed so as to put to shame the

father, who had once been an Arian, when he reflected that while honouring to the utmost God the Father, he had lowered the Word of God, his only-begotten Son, into a creature. If then such things as these, which cause scandals, could be put out of the way, peace will dawn again, and the cloud of enmity which has been brooding will at once be dispersed.

Thou sayest that thou didst for good reasons retire from thy chair, and didst shake off the dust of Moscow which clave to thy feet for a testimony against its disobedience. But would that there had not been this flight 'on the sabbath day, and in the winter;'[6] which has stirred up intestine factions and fightings, and occasioned those mischiefs which happen from day to day. It was a thing to have been much deliberated about first, that flight; a thing needing exceeding caution and anxiety, that retirement; that there might not befall thee, as has now befallen thee, the misfortune of Epimetheus, to whom, when he had done the deed, there came repentance. What was gained, tell me, in the name of the Graces, by this thy hasty removal? by thy unwritten abdication? by thy renunciation of thy chair? by incurring *the aversion of the people?* by the alienation of the emperor? For thou didst depart and hurry off without salutation, without any leave-taking, full of wrath, and replete with perturbation, very differently from Gregory Theologus. For that other Gregory who wrote his life relates that he went to the emperor, and in presence of the council begged his permission to retire and be at peace, praying for him and blessing him; and so he departed. And the patriarch Martyrius of Antioch is related to have declared in the church that he renounced the insubordinate clergy and the disobedient people; and so, spontaneously retiring, he died in peace, having taken upon himself the life of a hermit. But neither of them is recorded to have resumed his chair, or to have taken again in hand the helm of the patriarchate; but others came in their stead, and did all that is usual. But *thy beatitude*, after retiring, hast not been careful to remember that it was thine own choice to live in privacy, and to leave the burden of the patriarchate, looking rather to self-discipline or improvement. But, being come to this point, I cannot refrain from speaking out a little, and greatly praising the patience of our heaven-crowned emperor. Why, O man of God, didst thou endure for so long a

[6] Alluding to Nicon's return to Moscow in the night of Dec. 18, A.D. 1664.

time such a deplorable widowhood of the Church? such a long cessation of the patriarchate? this spiritual divorce, for four years and more? Certainly this was an act of prudent economy, a manifestation of patience, a mark of mildness. Ye have both been made a spectacle to the world, Alexis and Nicon, to see which of you shall gain most honour for virtue, which shall obtain the palm of victory, that is the prize of the contest. Nicon cries aloud, '*Repent!*' imitating that other Nicon whose name he bears: the monarch Alexis sings the new song, '*He that abideth unto the end, the same shall be saved,*' adding in imitation of Christ, '*Lord*, let it alone even this year also, till I shall dig about the fig-tree, and cast dung; and if it bear fruit of *obedience*, conversion, good works, well; but if not, then, after that, *thou* shalt cut it down, as being unprofitable, that it cumber not and hurt the ground, especially the place of the vineyard.' But I hear sounding in my ears the pastoral pipe of Christ, who cries in the wilderness, 'I am the good shepherd,' *i. e. the* shepherd emphatically, and the chief shepherd. The God-man, Jesus, does not liken himself to a hunter, but only to a shepherd, signifying by this theological symbol the gentleness and kindness of the shepherd: whence also the poet has happily called Agamemnon 'shepherd of the peoples.' But Nimrod, the giant and tyrant, is related to have been the first *hunter*, rejoicing in blood, in deaths, in the tearing to pieces of living creatures, clothed with the symbols at once of savageness and cruelty. Now thou wast vouchsafed to be made a shepherd of the rational sheep, O most blessed Nicon! holding a shepherd's staff in thy hands to conduct and direct to the pastures of salvation the sheep committed to thy charge. Thou oughtest, therefore, to know them, and to be known of them, overlooking them, giving them the usual episcopal superintendence, as caring for them. Otherwise thou shouldest be called a hireling, a careless servant, a destroyer of souls, a bishop of a flock not thine own, seeing the sheep scattered and taking no care for them, retaining no mark of love for the flock. From such love Moses cried, 'The Lord God of the spirits and of all flesh look out a man to set over this congregation, who shall go in and out before them, and who shall lead them forth, that this congregation of the Lord be not as sheep which have no shepherd. And, having taken Joshua, he set him before Eleazar the priest and before all the congre-

gation, and he put his hands upon him, and established him, as the Lord commanded Moses.' Who has ever seen a shepherd without a flock? If any one desire a bishopric ('an *oversight*'), he desires a good *work*. The episcopate or overseership is a *work* consisting in action and labour, not a thing of mere idea, an empty mental abstraction. It demands much pains, and long labour, and the work of an Atlas. It requires personal bodily presence. Dost thou not hear the herald of the Gentiles, Paul, charging the man that is a bishop thus: 'Preach the word; be instant in season and out of season; reprove, rebuke, exhort, with all long-suffering and doctrine. Be sober in all things; endure affliction; work diligently; accomplish thy ministry of a preacher of the gospel'? How can such things be performed by one who does not abide in his chair, nor is present to perform them? who does not actually administer the functions of the patriarchate? Be thou thyself thine own judge: thou art the fittest of all men. If any other man were patriarch, and had remained so long a time away from the patriarchate, wouldst thou have endured such an orphanage, such a widowhood and divorce? or wouldst thou not have chosen rather to have another ordained in his stead for the conduct of this numerous people, for the management of this great nobility, for the credit of this immense monarchy? What thou abhorrest for thyself, that do not thou to another. 'With what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you again.' 'Nothing in excess.' 'Press nothing too far.' 'Know thyself;' and 'attend to thyself.' O *man of loves*, most learned, lift up thine eyes round about thee, and see thy children needing the conduct of a patriarch. How long wilt thou forget thy flock? how long wilt thou be angry and fixed in thy fury? Thou hast heard the trumpet of the gospel sounding in thine ears, 'Learn of me; for I am meek and lowly of heart.' 'Let not the sun go down upon thy wrath,' on the provocation of thy brother. But thou, how many revolutions of the sun, how many courses of the moon, how many beginnings and ends of years, hast thou not allowed to pass while persisting in thy wrath, acquiescing in irritation, O chief shepherd! Listen to my words, O golden head of this golden-fleeced flock, and be joined to thy members, which, like those of Pentheus, are torn asunder, and scattered here and there, by spiritual bacchanals. It is not for the good of the Church; it is not for the advantage

of the monarchy; it is not lawful for thee to remain away from thy chair. Thou doest contrary to the canons; thou offendest against the laws; thou doest contrary to what is just. I must proclaim the gospel aloud, and at the very top of my voice: *my zeal endures not delay:* All cry out against thee; all admonish thee to lay aside thy wrath. Stop not thine ears with wax against my siren strains, nor put up thine hands to them, so as not to hear. At my incantations and endearing invitations let my brother go down to his garden, and eat the fruit from the ends of his branches [such as nuts, chestnuts, and almonds], to feed [his flock] in the gardens, and to gather lilies. Yea, yea; come *down*, and come *up* hither: for when thou didst go down hence, thou wentest up [*i. e.* didst act haughtily]. Let the censures of those who love to censure be silenced: let the word-splittings of biting malignants be put to confusion. Understand that the four patriarchates are looking anxiously to see the end of this difference. The imperial city of Moscow has become a spectacle for angels and for men. May my tongue cleave to my throat if I speak falsely! How should I lie, if, according to Malachi, the lips of the priest lie not? whose words are silver tried in the fire, more precious than gold and topaz. But thou wilt say, 'There has been convened against me a local synod, in spite of my disallowance, to spin an unjust deposition, and to weave together what cannot be woven together, like Penelope, unravelling the web of the divine canons.' What then? was not *Athanasius* condemned? Was not *Chrysostom* calumniated? Shouldest thou not rather sing thanksgivings to God that thou hast nothing else to charge [against that synod] but the length of time of six months [that it sat without doing anything]? It is better to trust in the Lord than to trust in man. Thou trustedst very much to thy ordination [to thy having ordained all the bishops], and thou wert deceived in thy hopes, O most blessed man! A horse is a vain thing to save a man. Deceptive are the minds of men, whose eyes and worship turn and gaze on prosperity, as the heliotrope turns to the sun. The world is full of applauding flatterers, who cry, 'Great is Hanno! Great is Psaphon!' He sails before the wind who has extraordinary prosperity; but when the weather changes, and the wind becomes contrary, then the judgments even of brethren are manifested, and the thoughts of friends are tested. Thou art offended at

the bishop of Kroutitz for having made the procession on the ass, which it was for thee only to do. But I hear (whether truly or not) that others also in this wide empire are in the habit, openly and unblamed, of making this same procession on the ass on Palm Sunday, as the metropolitan of Novgorod, and the archbishops of Kazan and Siberia. It was indeed for thee to personate our Lord in this symbolical act; but thy absence leaves it open for such things to be done by others. For it would be unreasonable that the ancient order of the Church should be put an end to, and that the most serene sublimity of the Christian monarchy should be clouded, for reasons out of place and altogether fictitious (δι' αἰτίας παρενηλλαγμένας καὶ ὑφειμένας τὸ σύνολον). The custom of appointing vicars is certainly one in full use in the Church: and if the metropolitan of Kroutitz *by the common suffrage and by the imperial mandate*, act as vicar, without having permission to do any single thing belonging exclusively to the patriarch, (for he neither sits in thy chair, nor does he sit on the holy synthronus when celebrating the holy liturgy, as I myself can vouch, having seen with my own eyes), and *makes common commemoration of all the patriarchs, as thou didst direct and enjoin to be done*, I do not see for what act such a one is to remain under an anathema, except it be for the attempt at poisoning, the very idea of imputing which is a great stain and a reproach; yea, by truth, the sovereign of all things. But I am now come to the capital point, and the Achilles of thy arguments, which if we can demolish, we may then erect our trophy, and inscribe on it, 'The victory is with the Emperor Alexis.' 'The emperor,' thou sayest, 'judges ecclesiastical causes, appoints archimandrites, has instituted a prætorium of [*i.e.* over] monks [the lay monastery court], takes from the monasteries whatever he pleases, and, while he does thus, thinks that he owes no account to any one, as being absolutely a hallowed person.' But these things, and things exactly parallel or like to these, thou wilt find in the holy Scriptures to be the customary and hereditary *rights* of kings. For when the Hebrews sought from Samuel a king, saying, 'Now therefore appoint a king over us, to judge us, like the rest of the nations,' they heard this in reply: 'This shall be the *right* of the king: he shall take your sons to reap his harvest, and to get in his vintage, and to make his instruments of war, and the furniture of his chariots; and he shall take your fields,

and your vineyards, and the best of your olive-yards he shall take, and shall take the tenth of them for his works; and he shall take the tenth of your flocks, and ye shall be his servants.' Read also Deuteronomy, wherein are these precise words: 'When thou shalt be come into the land which the Lord thy God shall give thee, and shalt say, I will set over me a king, whom the Lord God shall choose; thou shalt set a king over thee of thy brethren; thou mayest not set over thee a stranger, who is not thy brother. He shall not multiply to himself horses; neither shall he make the people to return into Egypt.' And in ch. xi. he continues: 'A prophet from among thy brethren, like unto me, shall the Lord thy God raise up unto thee; him ye shall hear.' Therefore we see that it is a special right of the king to judge others, and not to be judged by others. As also the codex of the Synedrion declared. This does not hold also of the bishop, who judges and is judged himself, bears witness and has witness borne against him. And this is plain from the example of king Solomon, concerning whom the third book of Kings relates thus: 'And to Abiathar the priest the king said, Get thee to Anathoth to thy lands; for thou art worthy of death this day. Howbeit I will not put thee to death, because thou barest the ark of the covenant before my father, and because thou wert afflicted in all things wherein my father was afflicted.' I pass over the emperors of old and of new Rome, who [so often] put out the patriarchs from their chair, according to their own will and pleasure. The example of Solomon is enough for the clearest certainty. He deposed Abiathar, and made Zadok priest in his room; so that the removal of the one was the promotion of another. The name of patriarch too is customarily given by the Jews to the first of their priests, according to Synesius, from the word *πατριὰ* (*tribe*) and *ἄρχειν* (*to rule*), as Dicæarchus says. Aristotle too witnesses thus: 'For every house is governed monarchically by the eldest; wherefore also at the first the different states were ruled by kings, as is still the case with the nations. And of the Cyclops Homer says that each ruled his children and wives; as do the heads of tribes and families with the Arabs: and hence arose hereditary monarchies. These, as being established by laws and going by succession, seem to be the most secure, and those which are called elective or tyrannical less so. Whence Alcæus sings of Pittacus in Mitylene thus: They made Pittacus tyrant

of the irrational and ill-tamed city.' So a tyrant and a king are not the same thing, but they differ most widely the one from the other. For though the poets that were before the Trojan war called the kings tyrants (wherefore also the poet described Echatus as the most unrighteous of all kings, without naming him tyrant), still this name was only in late times popularised among the Greeks; and it was in the time of Archilochus, according to the Sophist Hippias, that the name 'tyrant' [in the later sense] was introduced, being taken from the name *Tyrrhenes*. Tyranny was carried to a notable pitch by Dionysius, Phalaris, and Busiris. Afterwards by an euphemism they called tyrants also αἰσυμνήτας, as the same Aristotle relates, in treating of the polity of the Cumæans. Why have I inserted all this at length? In order that no one may ignorantly call our emperor (βασιλέα, *Basileus*), who is the *basis* of his people by succession from his ancestors, and has received his dominion according to fixed laws, by the name of 'tyrant.' The most Christian emperor shows mercy to all, showering on them with rich liberality his gifts; and, like another Titus, who was surnamed the Love and Delight of our mortal race, he daily cries, 'Come hither unto me and draw [to yourselves from] rivers of beneficence, alms, bounty: for from my fingers the graces [all manner of acts of grace] run, and I wish it to be said of me that my arms are long for giving, thinking it to be more blessed to give than to receive.' And if we should hold our peace, all the patriarchates would cry out together, like the brazen [tripods] at Dodona, giving out a harmonious sound. And I above all will shout like a Stentor to proclaim *his boundless liberality towards myself*; and, like the wall of Byzantium, my mouth shall return even a sevenfold echo. But I perceive Momus [the god of ridicule] gently whispering in my ear, that I shall wear out the soles of my shoes [if I go on so fast]. So I will make haste and run away as from a trap, decamping from what may be suspected as adulation. Yet I will not be diverted nor desist from repeating the oracular and most truthful injunctions of the thrice-blessed Peter: 'Fear God; honour the king! for he is the minister of God. Wherefore ye must needs be subject unto him, not only for wrath, but also for conscience's sake. For there is no power but from God:' [and so], as the apostle of the Gentiles reasons, 'he that resisteth the power resisteth the ordinance of God; and they that resist shall

receive unto themselves damnation.' Go then, now, and refuse to render unto Cesar the things that are Cesar's, or to pay him tributes; though ages ago our Lord Jesus Christ paid the census to the tribute-gatherers and publicans; and though in his parents he submitted to and obeyed the decree of Augustus, the monarch who then ruled upon earth, when he had ordered all the world to be taxed or registered. And now I understand why Vespasian and Titus, father and son, came with a great army and strong spirit, and destroyed the Jews; namely, to avenge the blood of the God-man Jesus, the only-begotten Son of God the Father, who had previously yielded and submitted himself of his own will to the Roman power. But hast thou the heart, O most reverend Nicon, to attack our divinely-graced and augustly-reigning autocrat and most legitimate heir of the Roman monarchy, the Kyr Kyr Alexis Michaelovich, after being used to see him so frequently coming to thy cell? Ah, what humility! Gracious! what respect [did he show] towards thee, the primate of the Church, before whom he presented himself with all modesty and self-abasement, so that often *the* most illustrious *boyars* of the council *were scandalised* at such quiet and most lowly humility on the part of the imperial dignity! Nevertheless thou, O most excellent monarch, didst not cease piously to remind these objectors of the reverence which Alexander of Macedon paid to Jaddua, the legal high-priest of the Jews. For if he, being a gentile, showed such great honour to the high-priesthood, saying that the high-priest's ministry was from God, and the dignity absolutely given from on high, ought not much more we, who bear the name and unction of Christ, to exceed, and very far exceed, gentiles in the grace of reverence, the honour of which reverts to the giver of all good things and father of lights, from whom is every good and perfect gift? Remember his innumerable acts of goodness to thee, O patriarch; how he raised thee from being an archimandrite to be metropolitan, and finally exalted thee even to the envied chair of the patriarchate itself. It is a grievous thing that thou shouldest kick against the pricks, O most blessed patriarch, and that, after having swallowed down in rivers the draughts of his sweet graces, thou shouldest ungratefully darken them with the perennial depths of Lethe; thou, upon whom my Eros Alexis went and emptied all his quiver. Call to mind how my apostle-like new Constantine cast

over certain spiritual stains the mantle of his imperial purple, and cast into the fire and reduced to ashes for ever the libels of accusation against certain ecclesiastical persons which had been presented to him. Didst thou not, during the absence of our long-reigning autocrat, remain with our august empress and the most religious imperial princesses as their guardian angel, to bless them, as the godfather and spiritual father of our youthful Cesar Alexis Alexievich, as the tutelary of all the palace, the honorary governor and careful keeper of the capital city of Moscow? What more could our most serene autocrat have done to thee, which he did not to thee? to thee personally, the patriarch, to whom this one thing only was lacking, to be called the actual and very father[7] of the emperor. Lift up, then, thy hands in supplication to the Lord, O most blessed patriarch, for the heaven-crowned city of Moscow, praying for our Christ-loving autocrat, for the imperial princes and princesses, and for the Christian people; and fall not to curses, to excommunications, to anathemas, for petty causes, and occasions taken from dogs.[8] For it is a shame, not to say an injustice, for such causes to separate men from the Catholic Church, and cut them off from the ecclesiastical body, and deliver them over to Satan, as the young Corinthian was delivered over for incest, to destruction of soul and body, and to everlasting torment. Not so, my thrice-longed-for brother; not so! But forthwith, giving heed to my words, return thy sword into its scabbard. For all who have taken the sword shall perish by the sword: that is, the excommunication falls either upon him who pronounces it, or upon him against whom it is pronounced: for it is a divine fireball and thunderbolt, which can by no means come or go without burning. But, O holy and sacred head, receive favourably this present letter, impressed with inward responsive love; and blame not *our Asiatic loquacity* (*βαττολογίαν*), which runs out indefinitely beyond the bounds of the apostolic character, I well know. For the loves do not know how to keep within the bounds; they overleap the stakes, and the ropes stretched to keep the course, spurred only by the œstrus of charity. Moreover, if in anything we may seem as men to have offended [*i. e.* if you chance to have heard any details of my former life, when I was a uniat in

[7] *i. e.* like the 'great hossoudar' the patriarch Philaret Niketich.

[8] Alluding to the dog of the boyar Sim. Streshneff. See the *Replies of Nicon*, p. xxxix. and 11, 16, 23.

the Propaganda at Rome; or afterwards, when living as if orthodox among the Orthodox], I hope it may be pardoned: for to err is common to men; and to be compassionate is the special mark of fatherly affection. Neither am I unaware that thou art a lover of the Greeks and a lover of the Romans,[10] being exact [in following them] both in dress, and in manners, and in dignity. Wherefore also thou didst write to the patriarchs about orthodoxy, doing therein well, and being minded religiously; forasmuch as from them it was that ye have the patriarchal dignity, even from Jeremiah of blessed memory, having received it as a light lighted immediately from the first light, and having since retained it among yourselves, and having it now by succession from one to another. 'Honour,' says the decalogue, 'thy father and thy mother;' signifying not only the father after the flesh, and the mother who is of earth, but much more the patriarch, who is therefore so named because he is set as a ruler of fathers. Yes, yes; think of the great church [of Constantinople] as a sister and mother compacted together with you by faith, *petri*fied [into one rock] by piety; from which both the definitions of the divinely-inspired fathers and the constitutions of the œcumenical canons have flourished forth and arisen, for the common profit of all, for the benefit and salvation of the world.

May you live in health for the longest term; for the defence and benefit of the ecclesiastical firmament, for the increase and strengthening of the Christian community. And let all the people say, Amen, amen! Written from Moscow, A.D. 1662, July 12.

Chap. XIV. *Nicon's idea of appealing to the Pope.*

When, then, Nicon had seen and read this letter, and could find nothing to object against any part of it, though he would have been glad to do so, he answered, as Aristophanes says, οὐδὲ γρῦ, *i. e.* not a syllable: only, wishing to imitate Paul (who once opportunely said to the governor Festus, when unjustly accused before him of the Jews, 'I appeal unto Cesar'), without knowing what he said, he cried out, 'I appeal to the

[10] φιλελλην καὶ φιλορωμαῖος, *i.e.* of the Greek and Romaic learning and orthodox Christianity, as well as of the Christians themselves of Turkey (Ἕλληνες) and of the Levant (*Roumi*), rather than of the Greek and of the Roman or Latin tongues and Christians.

Pope;"[11] not that he cared for the Pope, or had inwardly any agreement with him (for *how should he, having been from his birth ignorant of all these things and uninitiated?*), but he spoke those words merely for the sake of some empty appearance in the eyes of the vulgar, or, rather, to run through a little time which passes rapidly, betaking himself to a resource which was absolutely impracticable. For in truth it was utterly impossible that the Russians, who had received from Byzantium their religion and their baptism, from the patriarch Alexis, and their ordinations too, and the supreme dignity of the patriarchal authority, from the Eastern Church alone, should impatiently and abruptly run off to the Pope, who was, and who was considered to be, the patriarch of the West. Nicon, however, who brought down his own soul to the dust of death, and made it (to speak with Solomon) touch the gates of hell, put forward the Church of the Pope. And, as a ground in support and recommendation of his position, he alleged the synod of Sardica, which enacts that the bishop of Rome is by all means to examine the sentences of the other bishops. But this man, who thus all of a sudden and in a moment feigned himself a papist, ought first to have read the synod of Carthage, which spent little less than twelve years in examining into the exact truth of this very question upon which we now are. For it showed no respect to the council of Sardica, nor even noticed its existence. For, after examining into the genuine canons of the first œcumenical synod of Nice, it writes to Celestine even peremptorily and unceremoniously, that the bishop of Rome should no more presume to meddle with the decisions of the others, as there was no canon prescribing this mode of procedure. But we may say farther (for this proposal of Nicon is open to easy refutation on all sides), first, that the canon of the synod of Sardica, as being only local, was set aside by the Fourth œcumenical synod. For this gave *rather* to the bishop of Constantinople the privilege of examining the judgments of the others: and, what is more, the synod of Sardica, being only a local synod, overlooked and contravened the First œcumenical synod of Nice, which absolutely decrees that every diocese shall keep its own rights and liberties uninfringed upon. I do not wish to assert farther that Hosius of Corduba, who at Sardica represented the Roman presidency, offered, in order to

[11] See Preface to the *Replies of Nicon*, p. xxi. to xxiii.

gain favour, to give greater honour than was just to Rome. For I would not run the risk of slandering such a man, who had appeared as a champion of orthodoxy in the synod of Nice; though I am aware that at the close of his life he gave in to Arianism, and subscribed a condemnation of Athanasius, having some time before, at Sardica also, acted contrary to his former subscription and judgment. But if you allege the trite story, how, when the emperor Aurelian (though he was a heathen) was passing with his army by Antioch, the bishops who had deposed Paul of Samosata came to him, begging him to eject that heretical bishop, and compel him by force to leave the chair, as being now deposed; but the emperor replied, that he had not the knowledge requisite for judging their matters, and bade them take the cause to the bishop of Rome, and acquiesce in his decision, as he was a Christian like themselves; to this we reply that it is absurd to put forward to the Church of God the judgment of a heathen, and to insist on proving supremacy from such a source. For the First synod, as we have said before, decreed that each diocese should have and keep its own rights unchanged and uninfringed upon: and the Second synod defined that Rome should have the prœminence, because it was honoured with the empire and the senate, and *by no means* on account of the princes of the Apostles Peter and Paul. For if Rome is preferred on account of Peter, or Byzantium on account of Andrew, much more ought Ephesus also to be preferred on account of John, the beloved disciple, who lay on the Lord's breast, the son of thunder, and the sublime divine; and most of all, and before all, ought the chair of Jerusalem to have the primacy, where the Lord himself lived after the flesh, and as the great and first high-priest there sacrificed the great sacrifice by offering himself to God the Father; and whence, to say all in a word, the whole episcopate sprang as from its root; where the ministry of the apostolic chair was immediately planted by Christ; and whence the voice of the gospel went forth and was diffused, and the grace of the new covenant ran even unto the ends of the world.

Chap. XV. *Solution of the difficulty of the Synod.*

After some considerable time I, the metropolitan of Gaza, was called to the palace of the patriarchate, on account of an inquiry and discussion. The proposed and sole scope of the meeting was

to investigate the feigned appeal of Nicon to the Pope; and *whether* in truth the faith of the Russians *came from Byzantium;* and *at what time* history declares this nation to have become Christian, and to have changed from heathenism to piety? And I answered, that Curopalata relates, in his Life of Basil the Macedonian, that this emperor having made a treaty with the Russians, he, among other things, desired them to accept saving baptism, and, farther, sent an archbishop to them to instruct and baptise them; but they refused to lay aside their errors unless they should see some miraculous sign, like that of the Three Children, which Alexis the archbishop chanced to refer to in his instruction. They desired then that the holy book of the gospel should be cast into the fire, saying, that if it were not consumed they would embrace the faith of Christ. Hereupon, he says, the archbishop, having first prayed, cast the divine book into a blazing pile; and the heathen, having for several hours seen it remain in the fire unconsumed and not hurt, forthwith came over to Christianity. The like is related also by Zonaras, Cedrenus, and Nicephorus Callistus, who however, without referring to any other source, add that the bishop entered into the fire together with the gospel, and remained safe and unharmed; as also a priest clad in all his sacerdotal attire, bearing the holy lance, came out from the fire [in the first crusade] unburned and unsinged, with no smell of smoke about him. Also, concerning the appeal, Matthew Blastar was brought forward, who, in his chap. xi. about Privileges, says, that from the canon of the Second council, and from canon xxxvii. of the Seventh, they think that it belongs to the patriarch of C.P. to ordain also the bishops among the barbarous nations which border upon his dioceses, such as are the Alans (*i.e.* the Circassians), the Ziachs and Asvazes, who are now called Ampazades, and the Ross; of whom some border on the Pontic, others on the Thracian diocese. Now the Asian diocese extends to the Tauric mountains; the Pontic has those sees which lie along the Euxine as far as Trebizond, and beyond; the Thracian extends even as far as to Dyrrhachium. For though it be true that in old time the metropolitans of Thessalonica, Athens, Corinth, Palæa Patræ, Ravenna, and Monembasia, were entitled by the Pope his legates and vicars, as representing his person and filling his place in synods, still all these were bishops of the Eastern Church; and this plan was devised only on account of the length of the jour-

ney, that whenever there might be any occasion to send to the Roman bishop, they might not be deterred by having actually to cross the sea. It will not be unseasonable to insert here some things collected from the lives of SS. Methodius, Cyril, and Clement, which are very beautiful and profitable.

In the time of the prince Boris, a man of good talents and very susceptible of good impressions, the Bulgarian nation, as they say, began to be Christian and to receive baptism. And at that time there flourished the saints Cyril and Methodius, who seeing the numbers that were converted and baptised, and that needed solid spiritual nourishment, invented the Slavonian letters, and supplied the wants of the time by translating the divine scriptures into the Bulgarian tongue. This conversion of the Bulgarians from their Scythian errors took place as late as A.M. 6370, A.D. 862, in the time of Adrian[12] Pope of Rome, and Michael emperor of the Romans: and it was the occasion of increasing the schism by reason of the dispute to which of the two ought this nation to be subordinate, the bishop of old or the bishop of new Rome. Hence came the practice of rebaptising, the Romans [*i.e.* the Greeks of Constantinople] rebaptising such as [had already been baptised by the Latins, and] the Latins such as had already been baptised by the Romans. Wherefore Simeon metropolitan of Thessalonica says in his Dialogue about Heresies: 'Farther, they also administer baptism not as the Church has received, but after a different fashion. For they perform it not by three immersions, but by three affusions, and without chrism, contrary to the tradition of the Apostles and the ancient custom of the Church.' This was said: and, after many words, the conference was broken up, because it had been drawn out to a great length, and the hour was very late.

CHAP. XVI. *Questions of the Boyars.*

From this time an extraordinary fame of the metropolitan of Gaza was blazed abroad, and was in the mouths of many, and pervaded the whole court of the emperor: wherefore he was often called upon by the council to answer questions; on which occasions he had for his interpreter a certain man of Moscow, named Lucian, who was acquainted with the Latin language. It would be tedious if I were to propose to set forth at length

[12] Adrian II., whose accession, however, was in A.D. 867. The baptism of Bogoris, or Boris, was really in A.D. 865, under Pope Nicholas I.

each of the questions which were so addressed to me, and which contained abundant matter. Yet I shall think it proper to append at the end of this work some of the Questions asked me by the most illustrious boyar Simeon Lucianovich [Streshneff], uncle by the side of his mother (whose name before marriage was Eudocia Streshneff) of our invincible emperor, as they are of great importance towards this history, for the more exact clearness of what I shall say; forasmuch as in those his Questions the said boyar of the council embodied all the demands of the afore-mentioned Nicon in the form of questions, which for the present, that I may not interrupt too much my narrative, I gladly leave on one side, reserving such mention of them as may be convenient for some other place. Those XXX. Answers then [which I made to the said Questions] were translated at the time into the Slavonic dialect by the emperor's translator, Stephen; and *many eagerly received them, and wrote copies of them.* But as there is nothing hid which shall not be revealed, at last one of these copies fell into the hands of Nicon, and blew up the coals of his wrath into a fiercer flame; wherefore also he sought a convenient occasion for revenging himself upon the metropolitan of Gaza. Howbeit he was not able directly to vomit out this his inward venom to the emperor, as the metropolitan was in the habit of going frequently to the palace, on account of different questions put to him. However, he waited in expectation, and looked out for an opportunity, and watched most closely what turn the main matter should take, acting for his own side with the most astute policy. By and by, one day in Lent [A.M. 1663], the metr. of Gaza was called for privately, and was asked by the grandees of the council in what way the Church, which all these years past had been suffering damage, and had been left deserted and in widowhood, might be definitively delivered from this widowhood? for it seemed very scandalous that the Church should be headless, and this patriarchal chair so long be seen empty, without any lawful pastor and good hierarch. Hereupon the metropolitan of Gaza replied, that the above was reasonable and just; and the bride of Christ, the holy Church, might very easily obtain her deliverance, if only the potent majesty [of the emperor] were willing to assent to my counsels, and would carry them into effect with his whole soul and resolution. Hereupon the heaven-crowned emperor himself made his appearance; and, after many questions

and proposals, said: 'Tell me, in the name of truth itself, thy plain mind about the rectification of our ecclesiastical affairs.' To which the metropolitan of Gaza replied, 'Send letters to the four œcumenical patriarchs, and make known to them the case respecting Nicon, stating briefly his demands, or, I may say, presumptions; for so you will at once obtain your object.' The monarch said, 'Well, you must let me have a little time to think upon it, and to consult with my boyars, and then I will send and call for thee again, so soon as I shall have fixed all, and turned over this counsel in my mind. In the mean time give me thy hearty blessing; for '*he has come to us*,' *as he says* [quoting a Greek iambic line], '*with auspicious foot*.'

Chap. XVII. *Resolution of the Emperor.*

After a few days the emperor sent again for Paisius the metropolitan of Gaza, and declared his mind that letters should be written to the œcumenical patriarchs. But there was no small difficulty as to who could be trusted to carry and deliver them when they were written: and after many [had been mentioned] the metropolitan of Gaza suggested the most accomplished hierodiakon Meletius, a countryman and friend of his own. Nicon was informed of everything (for there are even in kings' palaces Midas-like listeners, who report accurately what is done to their correspondents); and he strove by every possible stratagem and contrivance to bring to naught and hinder the execution of the good counsel that had been given. For he wrote information that Meletius was a *forger*, and only seeking a specious opportunity to abscond, as being a runaway already, and ready to run away again to his own country. To this the metropolitan of Gaza answered, that the patriarch's perturbation was natural enough, and that he uttered all these tragical things of his own passion, inasmuch as he foresaw exactly what would happen, and what was planning against him. 'But who then,' said the emperor, 'will stand surety for the man that he will return, seeing that he is accounted to be double-minded, and to have scarce anybody to give him a character but himself?' 'I myself,' said the metropolitan of Gaza, 'will vouch for him, and will pledge myself that he shall return.' 'And I,' put in the emperor, 'am confident that Meletius will serve us faithfully, and will return to us as speedily as possible with golden tidings.' Dionysius also,

the archimandrite of the monastery of Iviron [on Mount Athos], expressed his concurrence in what was said, and pledged himself for the fidelity of Meletius before all the council. So he had three sureties to vouch for him, an emperor, a metropolitan, and an archimandrite. What need is there to lengthen our words after the Asiatic fashion? The letters were written privately to the four œcumenical patriarchs; and Meletius, *with liberal presents*, and with allowances for his journey, departed from Moscow, in the year 1664, Jan. 1.

Chap. XVIII. *Another villanous machination of Nicon.*

Meantime, *while we were thus occupied*, there bróke out another mischief: for Satan, the enemy of peace, the deceiving spirit, instigated Nicon openly to curse the emperor, and absolutely to deliver him over to Satan. But that this might not be notorious to all, and manifest to the simpler sort of them that were in the monastery, he cunningly veiled his malicious wickedness. He spread out the imperial letters,[13] which were sealed with the great seal, on the top of a low stand (an ἀναλογεῖον), and caused to be sung the curses of psalm cviii. (which contains thirty curses against the traitor Judas, who sold the Lord for thirty pieces of silver, as says Theodoret), with these words of imprecation, 'Let his children be orphans and his wife a widow; let his days be few,' &c., with a loud voice, so that all should hear. This was reported immediately to the great emperor, who, as soon as day dawned, called together all the bishops who were to be found, and related to them, not without tears, what Nicon had done, as has been described above. 'Grant,' added the supreme monarch, 'grant that I myself have erred and do err, yet of what sin have my dear children been guilty? and he said in imprecation, "Let his children be destroyed, and his posterity clean put out." Or wherein, again, has my wife and empress offended? and yet he has recklessly imprecated curses on all persons, men and women alike, of my court.' We all blushed with shame at the hearing of such things; and with one voice and consent they earnestly besought the emperor for a searching and exact investigation of the matter. The most excellent monarch assented, and dismissed us, and returned to his apartments. And

[13] See the *Replies of Nicon*, p. 588.

in the morning he called together again both the synod and the council, to consult with them as to whom he should send. And by common consent the metropolitan of Gaza was appointed, as being most learned and eloquent, and able both to give him who should ask, and to extort from another, a direct answer. He was called therefore to kiss the emperor's hand, having for his fellow commissioner Joseph the archbishop of Astrachan, and for their subordinate the archimandrite Theodosius. And, having taken permission, he departed to the synod of the bishops, to consult with them, and to learn how he was to accost Nicon. 'Am I,' he said, 'to kiss his hand, and give him the due salutation, or not? Am I with persuasive words to try to soften his stern and adamantine heart? or to use the bluntest words, and be as plain-spoken as possible, as representing the person of the emperor and the synod?' To these questions the synod replied by determining that I was not to salute him, nor to be altogether courteous, until I had first examined and made out with complete exactness what he had really done; 'after which, as a wise and discreet man,' they said, 'you will be able with full confidence to act according to the dispositions of the man, and according to circumstances at the moment.' The boyars also [members of the council, who were sent as commissioners] asked about this very same thing (they were three, the prince Nicetas Odoefsky, the φρούραρχος or commander of the guard Herodion Streshneff, and the secretary and keeper of the seal Almiaz Ivanoff), whether they were to kiss Nicon's hand, and take his blessing? They all replied in the affirmative; seeing that, though Nicon is not patriarch as before, still he must in justice be considered as one of the sacerdotal order; and every one who is such, so long as his judgment and condemnation be not lawfully pronounced, blesses the laity and sanctifies them indifferently; seeing that the less is blessed of the greater.

Chap. XIX. *Departure of the imperial Commissioners.*

We set forth, therefore, with full instructions, and escorted and attended by soldiers on all sides, July 17, A.D. 1663; and the next day, at the hour of vespers, we arrived at the monastery of the Resurrection, falsely called by him 'New Jerusalem:' and, after halting a short space in the hospice, the most illustrious Nicetas Odoefsky sent a man to announce us to Nicon, to say

that there had come certain bishops as commissioners to speak and confer with him. But he was greatly disturbed at hearing there was such an array of soldiers come, and said to them that were about him, being troubled, no doubt, by his own conscience: 'Their coming bodes no good; they want to send me away to a distance.' Nevertheless, outwardly assuming a look of keenness and self-possession, he asked who they were that were come, and especially what the metropolitan of Gaza could do among them, 'being a stranger, and of another language, who has never before been to salute us, or pay us the due obeisance; or, what is more essential, to exhibit to us his letters commendatory and dimissory, according to the custom?' And the most illustrious boyar [on hearing this reported] said, 'He will come himself, and make his own excuses to the patriarch. Come, let us go, with God's help.' So he went forth from the hospice: and, having come to the gate of the monastery, we chanted the Ἄξιον ἐστὶν as usual, and went in, and went to the cell of the patriarch, a long line of monks standing on either side, and the soldiers following us. We entered, and he began to say the usual prayers, and stood a moment, awaiting our episcopal salutation: but when he saw that we did not go up to him, he looked us in the face and reddened, as, forsooth, being put to shame at our first approaches being so little friendly; and, drawing back abruptly, he entered into his inner chamber, and there awaited us, standing upright, and leaning on a bent-topped and thick staff, and silent as one dumb. Then I, the metropolitan of Gaza, began to speak *in Latin*, looking to Nicon: 'Our most serene emperor and autocrat of all Great, Little, and White Russia, Kyr Kyr Alexis Michaelovich, and all the episcopal synod, has sent me to ask thee from what motive or for what cause thou hast delivered over to an indissoluble excommunication and most heavy curse, with all his house, our monarch, the most serene empress and Augusta, the Lady Maria, and their most supremely august children and our princes, the Kyr Kyr Alexis Alexievich and Theodore Alexievich, whom the Most High has given to us to reign upon the earth for the glory of the ecclesiastical firmament, for the increase and happiness of the Christian community?' This was translated into Russ by the emperor's interpreter Simeon; and after he had ended repeating it all, as he translated it, Nicon began to string together words which were nothing to

the purpose,[14] never answering to the question, but only exemplifying that saying, 'Menecles says one thing, *the hog* another.' After long and patiently waiting *for them* (*αὐτοῖς*), I at length said, 'Answer, I pray, to the question, as the gospel directs, Yea, yea, or Nay, nay. Didst thou curse, or didst thou not curse, our emperor?' And Nicon said,[15] 'I make prayers and supplications for the emperor, and do not imprecate on him destruction.' 'How does he not imprecate,' I exclaimed, 'who applies the deep and awful curses of the Psalms to the emperor? viz. that another should take the bishopric of his empire, that his consort the empress should be a widow, and his imperial children become altogether orphans!' Many words were spoken on this matter *by the boyars*, who took him up with one consent, and disputed with him sharply. Nicon, meanwhile, was continually staring at me, dilating his fierce eyes: 'And thou, why dost thou come here, wearing thy mandya red, contrary to the proper custom?' 'Because,' I retorted, '*I* am from the *true* Jerusalem, in which the Saviour of all men shed abundantly his most pure blood, and by no means from thy falsely-named Jerusalem, which is neither the new nor the old, but a third, *perhaps that of the Antichrist who is to come.*' And he said, 'Why dost thou not speak to me in Greek, which is thy native dialect, but only in the accursed tongue of the Latins?' 'However,' replied I, 'this is the tongue you will yourself hear from the Pope, when you go to Rome *to present your appeal*, and to plead your cause. What have you to do with the Pope, tell me, by the Graces, from whom you certainly have not received the quality of patriarch, nor have ever received a blessing from thence, that now you should seek to run over to him to prosecute your appeal? I think too that tongues are not to be cursed; since the Holy Ghost of old came down in the form of tongues of fire. Again, I do not speak in Greek for this reason, that thou knowest not so much as the alphabet in this tongue. Nevertheless, I will speak to you and whisper in your ear something in Romaic: Thou—most tenacious maintainer of canons and laws, whence hast thou learned to dress beardless boys in monastic garb?' This discussion was drawn

[14] *i. e.* declining to recognise Paisius, or to be questioned by him; but bidding the Russian archbishop speak.

[15] Paisius dissembles the fact that Nicon never answered at all to *him*, and takes to his own interpellation the answer which was really made to the archbishop of Astrachan. See the *Replies of Nicon*, p. 584 to 604.

out over a space of many hours; and there was a great tumult among my fellow commissioners and the boyars. And Nicon stood there all the time continually shaking his staff at them; and striking with it violently on the ground, he fluttered them, thundering, confounding, lightening, answering alone to all of them, like Thersites, suffering none to speak again without catching it; so that at last we went out from his cell without having done anything, utterly stupefied at his obstinacy and headlong violence, and at the ungovernable rush and ready torrent of his words. But I, for fear of tediousness, have not related here the hundredth part of what the emperor's fast-writer took hasty notes of at the time. For Nicon, when he was speaking himself, expatiated at immoderate length, and concluded what he pleased, according to his own aim and will; but when any other was speaking, he anticipated him and cut him short, confounding him, and preventing him from finishing, and seeking to prove rather his own will and idea; so that finally we reëntered our own lodging utterly wearied and disgusted, as having only blown up the blazing pile of his wrath to greater fierceness. And so about midnight we [*i.e.* Paisius himself] arose and sang, according to rule, the office for the Lord's-day in the hospice; for we dared not go to the church after the horrors of the day before. Nor did we go either to the liturgy; but we sat by ourselves [myself], and waited for the rest of our company, who had gone earlier to the church for worship. And they remained there very late indeed at the church before they returned, in consequence of Nicon's having ascended his false Golgotha, and thence spoken words most profane, such as it was unlawful for men to utter, expressing his inward passion, and declaiming most energetically. 'For already,' he said, 'has come the band of the soldiers; and Herod and Pilate are ready in the hall of judgment [alluding to the boyars Herodion and Nicetas]; yea, and he also [Almiaz] who may answer to Judas: there have come also the high-priests [the archbishop Joseph and the metropolitan Paisius] Annas and Caiaphas;' applying in all its details to himself the drama of the Lord's crucifixion, caricaturing absurdly and profanely the awful mysteries of the Passion, calling himself most absurdly Jesus Christ. When at length he did finish (for they thought he never would), and our company had hurried home, and related the burlesque scene he had acted, we

were all much annoyed; and the boyars, having written down the words he had uttered, and the figures of his sermon, made an energetic report thereupon to the emperor: and we remained where we were, without doing anything farther, till we should receive from the emperor his final answer. In the mean time, however, they that lived close to the monastery [and within it] were summoned and examined, how, and when, and after what fashion Nicon had pronounced against the emperor the words of imprecation? and we ascertained very many things in agreement with the charges brought against him; and that he had poured forth very many other injurious words, full of the most brazen impudence. Nicon meanwhile, learning that all his conduct was being thus closely investigated, was studying how to make his escape as speedily as possible, and had a very light vehicle got ready, in which, very early in the morning, before it was well day, he was on the point of starting, to escape to certain cunningly concealed (*ὑφάλους*) hiding-places. But his intention of flying[16] was discovered immediately; and so he was prevented, and guards were at the same time set about the monastery. And after two days there came in haste Dementius the emperor's private secretary, with an order from the emperor and an epistle from the synod containing instructions to us to leave the place; but first we were to reprimand the levity of Nicon, and to impose on the monks about him certain needful injunctions; and after having so done, we were to return at once to the capital. Accordingly, having so done, we departed thence, and went straight on our way, and arriving early in the morning, and having given our blessing to the emperor, we joyfully kissed his hand; whereupon he immediately, with a gracious smile, said to me: 'Have you now yourself seen Nicon? have you discovered his vehemence and disputatiousness?' And I replied, 'Yea, by truth, it had been better for me never to have seen such a monster. I had rather be blind and deaf at once than see him, or come within hearing of his Cyclop tones, and muddy, tumbling, foaming torrents, stunning one above the cataracts of the Nile.' I had nearly forgotten to mention that, at the very time of our departure and return, Nicon sent libels against me to the emperor, making great apologies, on the ground that I had not kissed his hand according to the custom, nor saluted him, as was becoming, with

[16] See the *Replies of Nicon*, p. 603.

civil words; and that on this account it was that he had behaved roughly to me, who had not managed delicately the commission. And a thousand other charges he let out besides, which, for brevity, I forbear to mention, lest Momus should say that my history is nearly all about myself. So we will dismiss this subject, and return to the mission of Meletius, from which we have digressed.

Chap. XX. *Return of Meletius.*

Well then, Meletius, the man of careful diligence in *deed* as well as in *name* [from μελέτη, *care*], having arrived at Constantinople (to be brief), delivered the emperor's letters to the œcumenical patriarch Dionysius. (The patriarch of Jerusalem, Nectarius, happened to be also living then at Constantinople.) But Dionysius, on account of the imminent danger, and the fear he was under, could scarcely be induced to receive the emperor's letter; however, by the advice and recommendation of Kyr Nectarius, he did receive it, and broke the seal, and read it, bidding the envoy who brought it to live as privately as possible, and in a cell by himself. The issue was, that, after consideration and deliberation, it was determined that a formal document (τόμοι) should be composed, but anonymously, as against some bishop who was acting disorderly, in the form of questions and answers. This being done, a second copy of the said Questions and Answers was sent to the other two œcumenical patriarchs, Kyr Paisius of Alexandria, and Kyr Macarius of Antioch, to be subscribed by them. And they were accordingly subscribed, yet not without examination, or with little care for accuracy respecting these articles, which were in number xxv. In due time the two documents which had been sent arrived at Jassy, a city of Moldo-Vlachia, and were delivered to Meletius by the patriarch of Jerusalem, Kyr Nectarius, who was then staying there, with strict care and charge that they should be safely delivered into the hands of the most excellent autocrat Alexis. And at last, after a thousand troubles on the way, and difficulties from the movements of troops consequent upon them, Meletius the Sciote arrived at Moscow, bringing with him the patriarchal documents and other friendly letters, containing divers encomiastic expressions, precisely on the Sunday of Pentecost [29th May, A.D. 1664]. But the sower of tares and great adversary of truth stirred up Athanasius metropolitan of Iconium [then at Moscow] to give

out positively that the pretended subscriptions of the patriarchs were forgeries. And he attempted to give weight to this assertion from his own personal knowledge, saying that he had been sent expressly as an agent by the œcumenical patriarch Dionysius, his maternal uncle, to treat for the peace which was so much to be desired between the emperor and the patriarch Nicon. Hereupon a great clamour was raised, and there was quite an agitation throughout all the court, the members of the council crying out against him, 'How can a bishop without commendatory and dimissory letters be come as agent from the patriarch to the emperor, to treat of a matter of such importance as the very word peace implies?' So after there had been very much contradiction between Meletius and Athanasius the metropolitan of Iconium about the alleged forgery of the patriarchal signatures, the metropolitan of Gaza said: 'I can say, yea, by most unerring truth, that I can speak for the certain genuineness of this subscription of the patriarch of Antioch Kyr Macarius, and that not from his Arabic signature, of which I am no sort of judge, but from the Greek signature of the priest John of Scio, the patriarch's econome and countersigner, whose handwriting I know well; and so I can vouch for the subscription being perfectly good and genuine.' Farther, Cosmas also, the metropolitan of Amasia, said: 'And I know well the signature of the patriarch of Jerusalem Kyr Nectarius, who is my countryman and old friend.' Both these attestations gave great satisfaction to the emperor and the council. Still there remained in the mind a grain of doubt whether the patriarchal document was really genuine or spurious. For this is commonly the effect of slander, to beget a trouble in the mind, and to make a man's heart disturbed. And so afterwards I was yet again asked privately of this matter, what I really thought about the subscription, and whether I thought it genuine or forged? 'By God,' I replied, 'I wonder exceedingly at this present question. I think that it is exceedingly difficult to know for certain and distinguish the spurious from the genuine, the forged from the true; and it requires close examination and science. For whole books and documents, and the substances themselves on which they are written, are often counterfeits; and there is at the beginning of the treatise on dialectics an enumeration of the different ways in which this may be done. Nevertheless, as I have said before,

two out of the four patriarchal subscriptions are confessedly genuine; yea, and that of the œcumenical patriarch, as the metropolitan of Iconium himself has already attested, does not show on the face of it any blunder. There remains only that of the patriarch of Alexandria: and the Paraclete, the Spirit of truth, will not leave us altogether unconforted, but will provide something respecting this also to attest and declare its true quality. But as the case stands at present, I go with the majority, who have received the subscriptions as genuine.'

CHAP. XXI. *Second mission to the œcumenical Patriarchs.*

But our sovereign, Kyr Kyr Alexis Michaelovich, thought it requisite, in order to remove all evil suspicion, to send a second time letters of request to the patriarchs, and to persuade them, if possible, to come in person to Moscow, in order to the most complete and authoritative settlement of the business. So the same Meletius who has been already mentioned was sent again, together with one Stephen, by origin from Andros, who was a relative of the patriarch Kyr Dionysius, on this most useful service, A.D. 1661, Sept. 25. But as Kyr Nectarius was then sojourning in the country of the Albani (ἐν τῇ Ἀλβανίτιδι χώρᾳ) for the collection of alms, Stephen went to the patriarch of Jerusalem with a certain private secretary [of the tsar] named Porphyry, who had for his interpreter a man named Basil Pasmes, of Jannina, humbly and earnestly entreating him to go personally to Moscow for the general peace of the Church. And he *sometimes refused, and sometimes said he would go, being, in spite of himself, drawn two contrary ways at once.* Nevertheless, he was finally convinced, by letters which he received from Constantinople, that it was utterly out of the question for him to go away so far to the north, on account of the danger which threatened the holy sepulchre from the different nations, and especially from the vile Armenians, who sought to take away all the privileged sanctuaries of the numerous races, giving their money unsparingly to our rulers, who for that sole reason are constantly changing, oftener than Proteus, or than the Euripus which changes seven times in the night and day. So the two envoys having parted the one from the other, Stephen went to Constantinople, to deliver there to the œcumenical patriarch Dionysius the emperor's letters; while Meletius went to the other two patriarchs,

viz. to Kyr Paisius of Alexandria, and to Kyr Macarius of Antioch, to do his utmost to obtain that they should come. And having gone by sea to Egypt, and there having seen Kyr Paisius, after much conference and persuasive argument, he attained his end. And having gone thence to Mount Sinai for devotion, he there adroitly persuaded the archbishop of Sinai, Ananias, by his honeyed discourses to go to Moscow to attend personally the contemplated synod. Kyr Macarius of Antioch was in the mean time sojourning in Georgia, whither he had gone *to seek alms* from the Christians of that country. He also was gained over by Meletius, and induced to join Kyr Paisius by most *gold-beaming strings of words*. Meletius found too an ex-metropolitan of Trebizond, named Philotheus, and used his most *sweet* eloquence so well, that he stirred the man up and joined him to the others. But of these particulars we shall speak more at length hereafter. For their journey was not accomplished so rapidly in fact as our narrative summarily represents it; but the way was in truth difficult enough, and very mountainous and formidable, especially for elderly men like the patriarchs, who had been bred up and had lived all their lives in habitable countries, and had been used to summer climates, as dwelling at the navel of the world, and in its middle and most temperate region.

Chap. XXII. *Furtive attempt of Nicon.*

Nicon, on hearing of this second mission, gnashed his teeth, and his heart was smitten asunder; and after churning on it for a long time what scheme, think you, did he hit upon? It is something worth listening to. On the Sunday next before Christmas [A.D. 1664], about the middle of the night, he entered with a great company into the capital city of Moscow, and went straight to the cathedral, where he ascended the patriarchal throne, made distinct signs, and called all to receive his blessing. There was present at the time the *then acting vicar of the patriarch*, the metropolitan of Rostoff, named Jonah. And forgetting his own subscription and engagement made long before, never to receive Nicon as patriarch, he went up to kiss his hand, and ask his prayer and blessing, adding also, out of adulation, that he was come at a happy season. Thereupon, when they saw that he who held the first place in the church, the head, had submitted himself to Nicon, the rest all came running up with one accord

likewise for his blessing. So the proto-presbyter Michael, with all the inferior priests and clerks of the cathedral, kissed his hand; and the proto-deacon (also named Michael) thundered out, 'Farther, let us pray for our father and patriarch Nicon!' News of all this was carried across into the palace.[17] And the emperor, when he heard of the sudden and most inopportune and unlooked-for return of Nicon, was thunderstruck, and considered with himself whence *such impudent audacity* could have originated. And on the instant he summoned all the council, and sent for all the bishops who were in Moscow, with his commands that they should come without a moment's delay. I therefore also [among the rest] was called in haste to the imperial palace. And as I drew near to it, I saw an extraordinary multitude of lights lighted there [in the windows and galleries], and an indescribable blaze of torches all around it, so that I marvelled exceedingly at that unprecedented sight of the torches and lights; so that in truth, if there had been a hostile army of Scythians in arms approaching, or a horde of Leuco-Sauromatæ had appeared close at hand with their swords drawn, there could not well have been a greater confusion or clamour than at the unexpected return of Nicon. Verily then the emperor was indignant; the boyars shouted at the top of their voices; the bishops muttered 'Kyrie eléison,' and called on God, saying, 'Boje moi!' [*i.e.* Mon Dieu!], shaking their heads. All hurried pell-mell up the stairs of the palace. After some considerable space, the emperor asked anxiously what was to be done in this sudden conjuncture? And I, the metropolitan of Gaza, said, 'Let him be asked how he came in hither, and who had invited him, that he had with such confidence mounted suddenly, like a thief and an invader, the patriarchal throne, certainly before he had been tried, not to say acquitted?' Paul, the metropolitan of Kroutitz, was sent to question him, together with certain lords of the council. But Nicon, seeing the aforesaid metropolitan with an episcopal mandya and white camilauchion, spake thus to him sarcastically, drawing himself back as if in surprise, 'Who are you? You are entirely unknown to me!' But he replied: 'I have been recently consecrated metropolitan, and so now wear the usual episcopal robes. But tell me wherefore, without the will of the sovereign, hast thou thus suddenly come in among us? For thou hast come in

[17] Nicon himself sent the news to the tsar.

truth not bringing peace, but a sword against the new Israel, which sees thy exceedingly high mind.' Nicon, in reply, pronounced tragically a multitude of words which were beside the subject; and, after many senseless and idle words, he said: 'I have returned and come again to my chair, as Narcissus the patriarch of Jerusalem did, who after twelve years had deserted it.' (For this Narcissus was the thirtieth patriarch of Jerusalem; and having conceived a desire for retirement, he resigned the episcopate of the holy city, and lived a hermit life in some unknown place in the desert, and was succeeded in the patriarchate by Dius; and he again, on his death, by Germanus; and he by Gordius, in whose time Narcissus reappeared, and lived with Gordius in friendship and good accord. But when Gordius was dead, and Narcissus extremely old, for he was of the age of 117 years, a bishop named Alexander, who had come to worship at the sanctuaries, by divine revelation was made patriarch of Jerusalem, the aged Narcissus pressing him earnestly to accept the chair: and he afterwards died the death of a martyr.) The metropolitan of Kroutitz was sent back a second time, and, repeating often in different words the same thing, *besought* Nicon to depart as quickly as possible, to spare the Christian community the danger of trouble and disturbance. But he produced a note, and, holding it in his hand, said, 'Go, and deliver this to the emperor, to be read in the presence of all.' And the emperor, having with difficulty received this, opened it. The contents of that sealed letter or petition were *briefly* to *this effect*: 'After my long absence and fasting,[18] after long-continued supplication and earnest prayer, on this now the fortieth day, there appeared to me an angel of the Lord,[19] and said to me, "Go as quickly as possible, O patriarch Nicon, to Moscow, and show thyself personally to thy flock; for all will joyfully receive thee, and install thee in thy patriarchal chair." Trusting, therefore, this angelic revelation, that I might not be disobedient to it, or rather to God, lo, I am come here of myself, without notice, unannounced. Do ye then choose what it pleases you, and what ye like best, and do, as ye have it now in your own power, whatever ye deliberately choose.' We were all amazed at this fictitious reve-

[18] In his hermitage, near the monastery of Voskresensk.

[19] This may be a paraphrastic account given of the contents of Nicon's letter, by some one interpreting rapidly and *viva voce* to Paisius at the time.

lation, and at his fabling, though nothing was said: and all with one accord cried out, 'An angel of Satan has been sent to Nicon, disguised as an angel of light: notwithstanding, let this seer of empty revelations depart from us with all speed: let this buffoon of a man return to his monastery, that there be not any *rebellion*, yea, and needless *bloodshed* too, among the people.' So there were appointed of us three bishops, Paul of Kroutitz, Paisius of Gaza, and Theodosius of Servia; and with us three boyars, at the head of whom was George Dolgoruky, to notify to Nicon that he should get him away as quickly as possible, before the sun should be risen; else, if any mischief or severity should happen afterwards, he would have nobody to blame but himself. After this, showing his anger against us, and exceedingly indignant (for those of our party kept singing in his ear, in an under tone, and repeating over and over again these words, 'It is enough that you have had distinct notice!'), he, I say, at length, being convinced, in spite of himself, that it was so (*ἀποδυσπιστήσας*), casting a glance of anger and rage at us three bishops, and having *pricily* seized hold of the pastoral staff of St. Peter (the first metropolitan of Moscow), descended in the utmost wrath from the patriarchal chair, and, scarcely having made his reverence, went out hastily from the church; and having taken his place in the vehicle, as being manifestly detected [and having failed in his attempt], he fled off in all haste. And having shaken off the dust from his own feet, and having bade his attendants to shake it off likewise from theirs, he had nothing else to congratulate himself upon but the having got possession of the pastoral staff, which pleased him vastly; and, as if he had by a holy stratagem regained this his standard, he went away with it, and returned towards his monastery, without being seen, or hindered at least by anybody. But when this act of his was reported to the emperor, he immediately sent the metropolitan of Kroutitz, and with him two boyars, to reprove him both for his desperate audacity and for his most impudent sacrilege; yea, and in the name of piety to redemand from him the pastoral staff of the first metropolitan of Moscow. The commissioners speedily arrived.[20] But now, what rhetorical writer could worthily describe his unspeakable and cynical impudence, or relate all the scandalous things he said. I prefer to be a Pythagorean and an

[20] Really, they overtook him at the village of Chernevo.

Harpocrates, rather than to commit to writing his words, unfit to be repeated, or insert in my narrative his injurious expressions and sayings, lest I should seem even to foul the paper itself. It is enough to say that he was at last forced to give up the staff, however unwillingly; and that he who had feigned having received an angelic revelation confessed in terms that a certain boyar had desired him to come to Moscow; and as he spoke he produced his letter, and delivered it to the commissioners, that they might show it to the emperor; so making himself to be also a traitor Judas by betraying the secrets of his friend, and the mysteries which he ought to have kept secret in his own heart. And on this account that wretched man shortly afterwards was thrown into chains, and lost his property, his wife, and his own life.

Chap. XXIII. *Return of them that had been sent on the second mission to C.P.* A.D. 1665.

The envoy Stephen [after parting from Meletius], having reached Constantinople, had an interview there privately with the patriarch Kyr Dionysius, and delivered to him the emperor's letters: and the patriarch, having read them, bade him not show himself at the patriarchate, but only at the house of the most illustrious domina Roxandra, as she should be the medium through which to manage all details, and gave him to understand that his wishes should be accomplished and his requests satisfied. And with regard to all the scandal caused by the ex-metropolitan of Iconium Athanasius, who had disturbed the beloved peace, and had exceedingly grieved the absolute autocrat and his synclete by his inventions and lies, the patriarch wrote a suitable answer to the emperor, *appointing moreover the metropolitan of Gaza, Paisius, interpreter of the two patriarchal* τόμοι, *yea, and the most confidential mouthpiece of all the synod,*[21] as is contained in the patriarchal letter of instructions to him, which is preserved in the imperial archives. After this, Stephen, having met *Radoulas, the new prince of Hungro-Vlachia,* and having paid his respects to him, as having formerly been his patron and guardian, being fortified with the patriarchal letters, directed his

[21] Here a note made on the MS. observes that '*this, to the writer's own knowledge, is a lie; and that he knows, though he will not name, the man who forged the pretended letter of the Patriarch to Paisius here spoken of.*'

course straight to Moscow, and after many labours and perils arrived at *this* capital, to the great delight and satisfaction of our potent autocrat.

Nevertheless, the metropolitan of Iconium, Athanasius, again contradicted, recklessly asserting that the letters were spurious and forged, neither fearing God nor reverencing the emperor respecting the calumnious assertion of forgery, but in very truth putting on a whore's forehead. So he showed no shame, but both acted and spake most shamelessly, with more vehemence than before. The two were confronted before the emperor, viz. Athanasius ex-metropolitan of Iconium and Stephen the envoy and bearer of the letters; and there they had a great discussion, and reviled one another with a zeal which advanced the matter nothing. However, Stephen carried off the victory; and the metropolitan of Iconium was sent to the Simonoff, to pass some time there in retirement and disgrace; and there he remained till the time of the splended arrival of the patriarchs, or rather *till his untimely death.*

Chap. XXIV. *Embassy from the Emperor to the Sultan.*

Among the other requests of our most serene emperor to the patriarch Kyr Dionysius there was this, that he would send some bishop as representative of the œcumenical chair. To this earnest request the most holy patriarch replied, saying: 'This request should have been addressed [in the first instance] to our potent emperor the sultan Mahomet: otherwise it would be a difficult matter and one involving great danger, a matter likely to excite the utmost suspicion, yea, and to occasion even a bloody persecution.' There was much inquiry about this, and the most careful discussion in order to ascertain how it could be managed in the most becoming way, and in such way as to be absolutely in accordance with justice. And it was concluded at length that it was convenient, for the sake of securing the œcumenical patriarchs from all risk of scandal, and of placing the matter on a safe footing, that an embassy should be sent to the emperor of the Turks, to negotiate with him to put a stop to the continual incursions of the Tatars of the Crimea into Little and White Russia. So there was dispatched with sealed letters from the emperor one of the lesser ambassadors, named Basil Demetrieff, on the day of the festival of the Theophany [A.D. 1666], with

orders to go by way of the river Moskva to the city of Azak, which had in time past been given as a gift to the Turks by the emperor Michael. And on his arrival there, after making his public entry, he was sent on with great honour direct to Constantinople, where he stayed only a few days, and was then desired to go to Adrianople, where the sultan then was, preparing to attack the Venetians, who were doing their utmost to relieve Chandak in Crete. Well; the secretary of our emperor met with a gracious reception, and being satisfactorily assured by the friendly expressions of the potent sultan, and having without difficulty confirmed the peace, a thing which was welcome to the Turks, he was sent with strongly-worded and imperative letters to the new khan of the Tatars, commanding him no longer to let the Tatars his subjects make incursions as before into the country of Little and White Russia which was subject to Alexis Michaelovich emperor of Moscow, but make them remain quiet with a truce and suspension of hostilities. Such was the end and result of the first embassy of our absolute monarch to the potent sultan of the Turks. What came of it farther our narrative shall show farther on with all sincerity.

CHAP. XXV. *Another secret mission to the ex-patriarch Dionysius.* A.D. 1665.

There was also sent on another mission the kellar of the Choudoff monastery, named Sabbas, to Kyr Dionysius, who was now metropolitan of Thessalonica. But his mission had rather the appearance of his having absconded than of his having been sent; for it was managed so secretly that only three persons knew of it: all the rest knew nothing about it. The cause of this mission also was the difference and contention between the two Andrians, Athanasius and Stephen, about the letters which had been brought, whether they were genuine or forged. Sabbas left Moscow in company with Joannicius, who had come in the name of all the community of Mount Athos in quest of alms, on account of the losses which had fallen upon the monks there. He arrived happily in company with Joannicius at Thessalonica; and like Nicodemus of old, the secret disciple, he entered secretly to the presence of Kyr Dionysius, and, after having received his blessing and saluted him, opened his business, and told him for what purpose he had made that long journey. And Dionysius

having replied that all was genuine, and in particular having acknowledged the documents, yea, and testifying that all the subscriptions to them were genuine and free from any forgery, he dismissed Sabbas, *without, however, giving him any writing*, on account of the fear and peril which hung over him, καὶ ἀνωτέρας νοθείας καὶ ἀψευδείας ἐπίκεινα: only wishing the emperor all his desires, and victory over his enemies, he sent the man away with his prayers, providing him for the way with a letter of absolution. So he departed, and went thence to the œcumenical patriarch Parthenius. But he would not listen, to use a common saying, so much as with the tips of his ears to the requests Sabbas had to make, observing strictly the engagements he had made with Kiupruli, the vizir at Constantinople, not to write nor receive any letters whatever to or from the Russians without the knowledge and permission of the sultan, on penalty, if he was detected doing otherwise, of incurring capital punishment. So Sabbas returned without any success, having failed of realising his magnificent hopes (for he had left Moscow full of confidence that he should accomplish triumphantly all the objects of his mission), having come in nowhere (as the jockeys say), not even third or fourth, but with the credit of a Megarian for trustworthiness.

Chap. XXVI. *Pecuniary loss of the Metropolitan of Gaza.*

All these things were known to Nicon; for he had many spies in every quarter, who informed him of whatever passed; and hence he was all the more enraged against the metropolitan of Gaza, as he saw him taking part energetically against him. And fuel was added to his anger by the hierodiacon Agathangelus, in whose behalf the metropolitan of Gaza had before presented a written petition to the emperor that he would be pleased to recall him, and set him free from his banishment and confinement, though the emperor had remarked to him, more prophetically than hopefully, 'Thou ceasest not, good man, to interest thyself and petition for this monk; but hereafter thou wilt repent it heartily, when thou knowest what a villain he is: nevertheless, I grant you his liberty; he shall be set free in a few days; only remember to distrust (*as Epicharmus has it*); or rather, in the words of the Apostle, not to believe every spirit.'

So this miscreant returned from the place of his confinement, and attached himself to the metropolitan of Gaza as his interpreter, acting as superintendent, besides, of the new house which the emperor had built for him, honouring him also with many splendid presents for his house-warming at the same time. This good-for-nothing Agathangelus brought with him from the Solovetzky monastery two men, servants, whom he made over to the metropolitan of Gaza as capable of serving him. They were both thorough thieves; and one night, when they had found a convenient opportunity, and had managed to lay hold of the keys, they stole the gold pieces which the emperor, for his services, was allowing and causing to be paid to him, and delivered them to Agathangelus, as money of their own, to hold as a deposit in trust for them. The rascals were not content with this, but they took also a beautiful casket, containing a very large sum of money, pearls, and other precious things of great value, which I had saved for myself, and made off with all haste, and got clean away with it, causing no small loss to the metropolitan of Gaza, yea, and unspeakable distress. Officers of the emperor were sent to trace out these thieves, Agathangelus himself [as the most likely person to divine their movements] being the guide and director of the officers. And presently they were discovered in the great monastery of Troitsa, whither they had gone, as if to pass the night, so soon as they should have supped. They, seeing that they were discovered, contrived to find an opportunity to offer Agathangelus a large sum to buy themselves off; and that cunning scoundrel, having taken from them all that they had upon them—silver, gold, and pearls—brought them back to Moscow; and pretending to have put them into safe ward, by night, having waited till the metropolitan had left his house to go to *the vigil service of St. Peter*, he let them go. The emperor, being informed of all this, Agathangelus was immediately put into chains and cast into the dungeon of the patriarchal palace, through Paul the vicar of the patriarchate. And he lay there in prison some few days; and with many prayers and supplications he craved to be allowed to go a second time in pursuit of the thieves, finding twelve men to remain sureties for him. Whereupon, being suffered to go, and supplied with all necessaries, he went not after the thieves, but straight to the patriarchal monastery of Nicon, where he made deposi-

tion of a thousand calumnies which he belched out against the metropolitan of Gaza, both in writing and by word of mouth. And Nicon, whose ears were wide open, made use of this Agathangelus as a convenient tool, and furnishing him with letters and money, *sent him* diligently *to Constantinople*, with the intention of counteracting there, through him, both the hierodiacon Meletius and the metropolitan of Gaza: but the villain was recognised and arrested at Kieff, and brought back in irons to Moscow, as a manifest runaway and traitor.

Chap. XXVII. *Another commission sent from the Emperor to Nicon.*

In the year A.M. 7173 [A.D. 1665], Feb. 25, the most religious archimandrite Kyr Joachim of the Choudoff was sent by our heaven-guarded emperor, together with the most confidential archon Dementius, to Nicon, who was then in his hermit pillar, where he used to pass the time of Lent in retirement. The communication with which they were charged was to this effect: 'Most blessed lord! all the bishops who are now in the capital city of Moscow—Paul metropolitan of Kroutitz, Paisius of Gaza, Cosmas of Amasia, Macarius of Greven—have petitioned with many and most earnest entreaties our most serene and potent autocrat Kyr Kyr Alexis Michaelovich, emperor of Moscow and all Great, Little, and White Russia, no longer to forbid those who are daily taken in the commission of thefts, and murders, and other crimes, access to ecclesiastical penance; but that they be allowed to obtain absolution after oral confession of their crimes; and if they be found altogether worthy by their confessors, that such malefactors should farther have facility to communicate in the all-holy mysteries; and only after having had the benefit of such preparation and viaticum be led away at once to the place of their sentence, to suffer due penalties in satisfaction for their crimes. On account of this matter we are now come with instructions both to inquire and to take down the judgment of thy beatitude respecting this most difficult subject; because when thy all-holiness was aforetime patriarch in Moscow you laid it down, and farther persuaded the most religious emperor, that such pests as murderers and robbers making a profession of these crimes, and persisting audaciously in other like wicked and abominable habits, when

taken in the act, should be put to death mercilessly, according to the laws. For otherwise, if they were to confess and gain absolution of their crimes from the priests, they would immediately also be fit to be liberated and defended from their previously impending punishments, especially if they should first have communicated in the holy mysteries. To this effect your high dignity then instructed our most excellent emperor by words spoken only in conversation. But now the divinely-crowned emperor asks from thee to declare and set forth clearly and fully in writing all thy mind on this point, that it may remain permanently on record for ever, inasmuch as robberies have now become frequent beyond all former precedent: and hence his most mighty dominion is compelled, for the restraint of the multitude, not to be neglectful of such means of correction as seem to us proper, but to award offenders punishments answerable in severity to their crimes, according to what is called the lex talionis. But since our most religious emperor had received long since from thee, and held as an injunction and certain instruction, to sweep away utterly such malefactors, and take no account of them, as outcasts by the laws themselves, he wishes to have such a written composition as thy wisdom and learning may be able to supply, both for the full assurance of his good conscience, and also for a direct answer [which he may give] to the most reverend and venerable bishops and others who prefer and recommend a contrary judgment, and distinctly undertake to prove to thee clearly from the inspired Scriptures an abundant answer and refutation of [any exposition which may be shown them in a contrary sense to their own].' In reply to this, Nicon said: 'The desire of the most excellent emperor is reasonable in seeking from me a written exposition, for the better knowledge, that is, and instruction of posterity. Nevertheless, to satisfy properly a demand of such importance there will need some considerable time. Therefore I desire that some certain time be fixed and allowed me for the completion of this very good task. So do ye carry back word to our most religious emperor Kyr Kyr Alexis Michaelovich of Moscow, and all Great, Little, and White Russia, that within a reasonable number of days I promise by God's help and grace to discharge the duty I owe him respecting this his demand.'

The commissioners who had been sent returned to Moscow,

and made a very particular report of all that had passed; and the synod remained awaiting uselessly the composition promised by the boastful Nicon, and expecting it with the greatest eagerness. But would to God that it had never come to light, but the winds had carried it away and cast it into the fire of Etna, or into the flaming crater of Vesuvius! For it emptied out upon me insultingly all the dregs of idle gossip, and published, as upon the stage of a theatre, the most fanatical and tragical, headlong, and noisy abuse of me, satirically bringing forward one after another a thousand calumnies which should not have been uttered publicly, and irreverently revealing them to all; far from remembering, in his unyielding obstinacy, the right-minded counsel of the most Christian emperor Constantine, who determined not to read a word of the libels presented to him against the bishops, but committed them to the flames, as incapable of serving any good purpose, and reduced them to ashes, saying, among others, these words, worthy of Codrus, that, even if he saw any spiritual blots or spots on the priests with his own eyes, he would dutifully cover them with his own purple, and by no means expose as on the stage of a theatre these sacred persons, who are objects for the greatest reverence on account of their office. This big-lumbering-worded Nicon, however, wrote at his first outset, setting up his high neck most pompously, by way of preface, that he would say nothing of himself, but would draw all, as from perennial streams of living water, from the holy scriptures; yea, and that he had learned very much from the most holy œcumenical patriarchs; in some matters directly by word of mouth, in others intermediately through epistolary communications; he had learned the heaven-derived lessons of the Church not without careful attention, obtaining knowledge from one source or another: that among other things which he had been taught there was this ecclesiastical injunction, not to cast pearls before swine, swine being in truth all those who follow a swinish life, as are murderers and captains of brigands, whom he besought with many entreaties to abstain and to cease from their wicked deeds, *as Epictetus has it.* But such, if they do not in due time reform and repent of their evil deeds, but persist in their most wicked murdering and violence, shall obtain no absolution; but if taken shall find no sort of mercy, having refused to put themselves in the way of mercy, when they had before all the liberty they

could desire. For they who have been steeled against pity for their own souls, and have showed no sort of respect to the calling of the Church, how should they be fit objects of mercy if caught in the act of their crimes, when they have used not the present opportunity, nor have brought forth worthy fruits of repentance, when they are caught at a moment that suits not, and obey, *according to the saying*, only the persuasion of necessity? For, so far as depends on themselves, they would spend nearly the whole of their lives in every kind of the vilest wickedness, even if they were to live for the longest conceivable time. (And this persistence in evil and deliberate impenitence it is which makes the wicked to abide for ever in hell, as the deep mind of the great Augustine by reasoning determines, so as to punish by eternal fire the temporary crime of the man, with an everlasting recompense measured to his momentary sin, continuing with the continuance of ages of ages, and exacting the vengeance of retribution to the full weight of everlasting condemnation.) But in refutation of this insane error and wordiness of Nicon we have written more particularly and at length in my *treatise inscribed and dedicated to Paul of Kroutitz*. And for the present it will be enough to mention what Socrates relates in his *Ecclesiastical History*, lib. i. ch. 10: 'The most religious Constantine,' he says, 'took anxious care for the peace of the Church, and the concord of the world. For this end he called to the synod Acesius, also a bishop of the Novatian party, and asked him, if he also assents to the written and public creed? But he said: The synod, O emperor, has defined nothing new; for so the Church has received from the very beginning, from the apostolic times. The emperor thereupon asking him, Why, in that case, did he separate from communion? he related and enlarged on what was done in the time of Decius during the persecution; and explained the exact discipline of the severe canon which prescribed that they who after baptism have sinned any such sin as is said in holy scripture to be unto death are not to be admitted to the communion of the divine mysteries, but are to be exhorted to repentance, with the hope of obtaining absolution not from the priest but from God, who has power to receive them and to forgive sins. When Acesius had thus spoken, the emperor, we are told, made this remark: Acesius, set thine own ladder, and go alone by it to heaven.' This the Novatian Socrates confesses,

with no small censure of Eusebius Pamphili for having passed over such facts in silence (which, he says, many writers of history have done, omitting much which they ought to have related, either from prejudices of their own or of partiality for persons). So do thou also, O Nicon, who agreest with Novatus, and art another Acesius, set thine own particular and perfectly straight ladder right on its end, and go up by it perfectly alone to heaven. For no man is faultless, but God alone: but we, if we say that we have no sin, lie flatly, and utterly destroy ourselves, as speaking manifestly falsehood, and counterfeiting the sterling coin of golden truth. What is more, we shall be herding with the swine of the sty of the insane Arius, who, talking nonsense, blasphemously said that Christ himself sinned, taking for a mere man the Lord, who is single and double, one and two, in two natures, according to the verse, 'The Lord is God, and hath appeared to us:' as St. Eulogius Pope of Alexandria divinely testifieth, and with unanswerable refutations demolishes his madness, wickedness, and senselessness. But as for that passage of the gospel which Nicon alleged, 'Cast not that which is holy to the dogs,' Methodius, bishop and martyr, in his selection περὶ τῶν γεννητῶν, writes thus: 'Pearls, with Xeno, we understand to be the more mysterious lessons of the divine religion, while swine are they who are still wallowing like swine in ungodliness and all manner of pleasures. Before these, he said, Christ forbids us to cast the divine instructions, because they are unable to bear them.' However, though this great divine, Methodius, would have pearls to be the inner and more awful doctrines, I must say that we ought not to understand the swine to be simply the unbelievers [and wicked men], as having their souls altogether unenlightened and not adorned from above, as with pearls, with the apostolical precepts and doctrine: but we ought to take pearls to mean the virtues with which as with precious pearls the soul is beautified: and not to cast them to the swine is this, not to expose them, the virtues, such as purity, temperance and justice and truth, to the sensual pleasures: for these latter are like swine, devouring with a swine-like life, and making the soul to live in the midst of passions; as is excellently remarked by the most wise and learned Photius in his Myriobiblon. But I must return to my former subject, viz. to the charges and calumnies brought against myself.

Chap. XXVIII. *Manifold calumnies brought against the Metropolitan of Gaza.*

Before Agathangelus (*i.e.* 'good angel or messenger'), whose name should have been rather *Cacoa*ngelus ('*evil* angel'), had been set at liberty, Nicon had already sent [to Moscow] the stories which had been fabricated and put together against me, full of impudence, replete with slanders, so that at the bare reading of them the emperor was utterly shocked; and having called for the metropolitan of Gaza to the court, with certain special individuals of the archons, he showed them the letters of Nicon. The metropolitan of Gaza in reply said: 'O most serene and most just emperor, if there be only so much as one of all these calumnies which shall be found true, I will consent to be held guilty of all: but if I succeed in showing any single one of them to be false, I shall expect to be held guiltless altogether. For James, the first of our hierarchs [*i.e.* the first bishop of Jerusalem], says that whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all. For though he who has committed theft may not have as yet committed adultery, still, since he has transgressed the general prescription of charity, from which the particular commands of the law spring as boughs from one trunk, he has become in a manner guilty of all; as the Preacher also teaches, that "he who sins, though but one, shall destroy or lose much goodness," that is, the divine grace, which is the shield and panoply of all of us.' The emperor was satisfied with this answer, and said: 'The present is not a convenient time for it (for it was just at the end of the salutary Lent); but after Easter week there shall be a searching investigation into all these numerous charges brought against thee.' After this, on Palm Sunday, when the emperor leads by the bridle the white horse, on which sits the bishop in full robes blessing the surrounding people (in emulation, one would say, and imitation of Constantine the Great, who performed the office of strator, or groom, and held himself the reins of the horse on which Pope Sylvester rode, as that most religious emperor himself relates in his own edict), —on the day of that high festival, I say, the most absolute sovereign, wishing to gladden the metropolitan of Gaza, Paisius, in his tribulation, presented to him a very handsome head-dress

(κίδαριν), which he had caused to be prepared, making a display of his grace towards him, so that all marvelled at this unusual decoration. Nicon heard of this, while yet doubting [what success his information might have], and was cut asunder in his heart; and he gnashed his teeth still more when he learned in addition that in the ceremony of the Lavanda the metropolitan of Gaza had represented the person of Peter. Nevertheless, he waited, and watched what should be the final issue of the matter. And, after the Sunday of St. Thomas, the metropolitan of Gaza wrote a petition, imploring the religious emperor to examine the deadly charges alleged against him. 'For though,' said he, 'I am from the region of Jerusalem, *and ought to be judged by my own patriarch Nectarius*, still, of my own free will and mind, I submit myself to this synod of the Russian bishops. Therefore I desire that the investigation concerning me should take place as speedily as possible, for my perfect clearing.'

CHAP. XXIX. *Decision and investigation by the Synod.*

Hereupon the emperor issued his commands that the heads [of the grandees and of the clergy] should meet at the palace, and examine with the most searching accuracy those two principal and deadly points: first, whether the metropolitan of Gaza is of orthodox belief, and keeps whole and undefiled the tradition of the faith received from the fathers; and secondly, whether he cultivates the art of magic and *vain astrological calculations*. There were introduced in his favour a vast number (lit. a myriad) of trustworthy witnesses, who said that his accusers were simply liars, and that there was no ground whatever for their charges. And these farther confirmed their depositions by subscribing them with their own hands. While this terrible ordeal was going on, Agathangelus, or rather (as he was in truth) the angel of Satan, was brought in fettered: and the next day he was brought before the imperial tribunal, greatly confounded. But, O marvellous impudence of the man! while being exposed and convicted, he brazened it out the more audaciously; he uttered slanders unblushingly; or rather he set at naught the imperial court, speaking loud, and fighting indifferently with all. At last it was ordered that he should be also made to appear in the patriarchal palace before the synod, and make the due and proper defence of himself touching all that had been falsely written and

said against the metropolitan of Gaza. However, this snorting declaimer was convicted and proved most clearly to be a slanderer, and accuser of bishops, and was sent away in irons to the new monastery of the Ascension, where he was kept a long time, until he petitioned for grace, having first publicly declared in the synod that all that had been said and written against the metropolitan of Gaza was false. And the metropolitan of Gaza, in imitation of Christ, forgave him: but the other Russian bishops would by no means forgive him, but rather cried out, on the other hand, that this man of wicked tongue ought to be disciplined with ecclesiastical penalties, for a lesson and warning to all other hieromonachs; and indeed, also, for the sake of the bishop whom he had calumniated; that there might be nothing wanting to his canonical and complete acquittal. Such an acquittal was pronounced afterwards, on a review of the matter, *by the three patriarchs*. For so soon as the much-desired coming of the two patriarchs was announced, all was economically hushed up and allowed to go to sleep, as there was need to turn to other matters.

Chap. XXX. *Ordination of new Bishops.*

Now while Nicon, that bad husbandman, was sleeping, and while he was snoring, 'as if rolled up in five blankets' [here he quotes Aristophanes], the old enemy of mankind came, and in the happy field of Christ's Church sowed among the wheat an abundance of divers kinds of tares, to pluck up all which by the roots there needed many hands as strong as Hercules', or rather arms with a hundred hands on them, like those of Briareus. In truth, every sort of evil heresy is a kind of tares: nevertheless there is a difference: for such as spring up of a superficial curiosity respecting divine things are easily dissipated, and dissolved, as soon as the sun of the divinely-inspired scriptures rises, and reaches the mid heaven; but such as spring and grow up of crass perverseness and excessive ignorance are with difficulty to be rooted up; being intertwined, as it were, and fenced round with thorns, they can scarcely be got at to cut them off at top, and they can with difficulty be hooked with a sharp sickle near their roots below, being fit fuel for the fire that is unquenchable. On this account, the bishop's is a laborious kind of life, and not one much to be grasped at, needing many tools formed and compacted for his work by a long course of years, and reaching

forward to future ages. Therefore, seeing the great church [*i. e.* the patriarchal church] left dry and waste, and overgrown with wood, the sleepless eye of the emperor looked out for some convenient compensating remedy, to counterbalance the growing mischief of the time; and [when he had formed his plan], he zealously carried it into execution. So, after much and anxious inquiry and consideration, he came to the conclusion that it was necessary to put most industrious labourers into Christ's vineyard; men able to endure both the frost of the night and the heat of the day. Whereupon, *the canonical votes having been obtained, he* promoted to the eminent see of Great Novgorod the metropolitan Pitirim, by the usual form of translation; and in his room the archimandrite Paul was consecrated metropolitan of Kroutitz. In like manner Cornelius was consecrated archbishop of Siberia, Simeon of *Polotsk*, and Arsenius of *Pskoff*. And these being sent to their different dioceses, began efficiently to purge the threshing-floor, and to gather in the wheat, and to burn the chaff: and so, being tended by the husbandman, and moistened with the showers from above, the heavenly crop grew better, and put forth ears abundantly, for the sufficient food of the hungry, or rather also for their enjoyment. Whence, after a time, all the bishops *were convoked* to a general meeting, *very agreeably to the divine canons*, which prescribe that the bishops should meet in synod twice every year to consider what may be needful or profitable for the Church, as well as to cast out from the midst of it whatever scandals there may be in it, gathering together stones for the heads of senseless and heedless men, who found upon the loose sand the castles and bulwarks of their own inventions, in which they place such trust.

Chap. XXXI. *Synodical review of Nicon's acts.*

The bishops therefore, being assembled together in the year 1666, considered attentively all the acts and conduct of Nicon since his public abdication; and the former synodical decision and declaration of the bishops; and how by a stratagem he had invaded the patriarchal chair, grasping at it in contravention of all laws, only of excessive vain-gloriousness, and had seated himself in it as a robber, had disturbed the imperial court of set purpose, and had drawn over to him even the then acting vicar of the patriarchate, the metropolitan of Rostoff, Kyr Jonah, as also

the protopresbyter and the protodiakon, both named Michael, getting them by his stratagem to kiss his hand; and, above all, that he carried off, like a sacrilegious robber of churches, the episcopal staff of St. Peter the first metropolitan of Moscow, as a most expressive claim and token of patriarchal power. For this most sacred bishop, being a native of a certain city of Volhynia at no very great distance from Leopolis (Lvoff or Lemberg), left Kieff, on account of its having been ruined by continual incursions of the barbarous Tatars (happily so named, as if from *Tartarus*), and removed his chair opportunely and wisely to Moscow, in the reign of the most illustrious prince and despot Daniel (for they that at that time had the sovereignty of all the Russians were called Princes). And this prelate was very virtuous and venerable before God and before men, so that from the time of his death the Muscovites have been and still are in the habit of celebrating his festival with reverence and honour; and they preserve his pastoral staff as an emblem of the episcopal power. And since a patriarch of Moscow was created, this staff belongs to the patriarchal chair. But when any successor is awaiting it, it is laid up in the vestry, and kept with the utmost care. And on this account there was so much importance attached to this staff, that Nicon committed an act *of manifest sacrilege* merely that he might but seem still to retain and claim the patriarchal dignity and authority, and to show that he, Nicon, was still both in name and in fact the true patriarch of Moscow. And, on the other hand, our most prudent emperor contended directly with him for this staff, when he had now carried it off, energetically contesting the claim, and counteracting him, that he might cut up by the roots those hopes on which he had anchored himself; not thinking assuredly of the material wood of the staff, which was of no sort of value, but because it was an heirloom much more valuable than any gold and silver or jewels. With such great perturbation and trouble was the absolute monarch surrounded, and anxiously distracted, to recover the possession of the pastoral staff of Peter, the pastor of Christ and divinely-minded hierarch. It is worth while here to insert the well-considered all-holy words of the pope and patriarch and œcumenical judge Kyr Meletius Pega of Alexandria, which he wrote to Job the first patriarch of Moscow, to whom he also sent as a present the pateritsa (pastoral staff or crosier) of our most divine father

and lord Kyr Joachim, in A.D. 1593. He wrote thus, word for word: 'Your most exalted patriarchal chair shall also have as a present from us this staff, which, not for anything valuable about the wood, but for its valuable antiquity, has been held precious among us to this day. It is that which belonged to the thrice-blessed Kyr Joachim of Alexandria, who was patriarch for about seventy years, and lived till past the age of a hundred, the same that drank, by the grace of Christ without being hurt, a cup of poison; whom the illustrious and venerable Silvester succeeded; as we again, sinners though we be, have succeeded Silvester.' It was not, therefore, so much for the wood of the staff, which was of very common wood, as on account of their inward reverence for their former primate Peter, that there was so sharp a contention excited, and so much trouble taken. The pastoral rod of Moses was of wood, which he had received in succession from the patriarch Jacob, that which was the ministerial instrument of such great miracles. A simple judicial rod was also the staff of our most venerable father Nicon, who was surnamed 'Repent;' and it too, in like manner, is held in great veneration by the people of the isle of Scio to the present day; since a thing seems to be not trifling when it is dedicated to God; as Ignatius Theophorus in some place of his Epistles testifies. And so too the afore-mentioned patriarch Meletius, in his Epistle to Theodore emperor of Muscovy, to whom also he sent as a gift a most beautiful and valuable diadem, wrote that it was 'not so much noticeable for the jewels which ornamented it, or for the other materials of which it was made, as venerable for its antiquity and its brilliant associations; inasmuch as this is the diadem which was worn by St. Cyril, bishop of Alexandria, at the council of Ephesus, during the reign of Theodosius the Younger, being after the fashion of the M.H. Pope of the elder Rome, wreathed with laurel (*λώρῳ κοσμούμενον*); and his successors in the apostolic chair have been used to prize it as their most valuable ornament ever since. We therefore, as a blessing from ourselves, *present to thee* this ornament and treasure of the Church, to be added and kept for the future among thine other most imperial treasures.'

Farther, there was a careful and particular consideration and review made of the matter of the metropolitan Jonah; and it was decided that all that that archbishop had done had been

done involuntarily, from a sort of oblivion and confusion at the suddenness of the surprise. And for the more solemn testimony of his sincere exculpation, there was performed over him the usual vesting with the epitrachelion and the omophorion, over the holy table; which having been performed within the sanctuary, we were all completely assured that all the part that he had acted on that occasion had been without any ill purpose. In like manner were set free and pardoned also all the rest of the clerks who had fallen together with him, and had on that same occasion improperly kissed the hand of Nicon, all but saying those trite words, 'Where the carcass is, thither fly the eagles to it;' yea, and that other maxim, 'What their rulers do, the subjects will do also,' following in their steps and imitating them. We know that it is customary for very many things to be done privately; and even for ordinations which have any irregularity about them to be canonically made good; as, for instance, such episcopal ordinations as have been conferred by two bishops without the additional presence of the primate (*i.e.* the metropolitan himself) of the province, as the divine canons prescribe. Whence Meletius patriarch of Alexandria wrote to Sophronius patriarch of Jerusalem respecting Laurentius bishop of Sinai: 'I wonder' (he writes) 'if, after receiving the writing of the œcumenical patriarch, which he wrote to thee, he has ventured to disregard it and still claims to retain the episcopate, even if thou hast pardoned him, as some pretend. But do thou write to us. As for the judgment of the œcumenical patriarch respecting the ordination of the said bishop, it is perfectly just, and agreeable to the sacred constitution of the CCCXVIII. divinely-inspired fathers, who in their fourth canon have decreed that they who ordain a bishop must necessarily be at the least three. And that no one may fancy that this constitution is contrary to canon i. of the holy Apostles, which says that the ordination of a bishop is to be made by *two, or three*, bishops, the doctors unanimously explain that even two bishops, *i.e.* concelebrating with the metropolitan, may ordain a bishop (and so *with him* there are *three*); but when the metropolitan is not present, they require that there should be three bishops with voices; and if the ordination be performed otherwise than canon xix. of the fathers of the synod of Antioch decrees, it is to be of no validity and of no force? Take notice what is the meaning of these words, *to be of*

no validity.' Nevertheless afterwards, through great economy and condescension, this whole defect of the ordination was made good, as the same aforesaid Kyr Meletius shows, writing in express words thus to Joachim patriarch of Antioch: 'Seeing that the said Kyr Laurentius and they that are with him have come to feel their faults, and confessing them before the Church with repentance have asked pardon, we also have received them as repentant, on their engaging to conduct themselves for the future with more scrupulousness, and with careful abstinence from what is irregular. And we have thus received them, not lightly or out of hand, but on being also certified by your commissioners that ye (that is, thou and the most holy patriarch of Jerusalem, together with the other bishops then within reach at Jerusalem) have made good the irregularity of his ordination by concelebrating together with him.' But all this will perhaps seem superfluous and discursive, which we have now said to justify secret condescensions in cases of irregularities with allusion to the first subject-matter of this Russian form (σχήματος), which has been introduced now in our times.

Chap. XXXII. *Of certain heterodox Schismatics.*

For, one thing leading suddenly to another, a Stygian swarm of greater evils burst forth, and fell upon an evil work, which was followed by a vast multitude of all the people, welcoming what was a most grievous and wasting plague to the orthodox Church of the Russians. And this was all through the excessive imprudence of Nicon, who, like Epimetheus, opened Pandora's box, and repented too late; who acted at one time in one way, at another time in another, with inconsistency, and was a cothurnus [like Theramenes], by no means standing firm in one judgment, but Proteus-like suited himself to all the seasons, and was ever changing with them. For there sprang up suddenly, to the peril of the whole Russian Church, certain new schismatics named Lazarus, Abbacoum, Epiphanius, Nicetas, Nicanor, Thyrsus (a bacchanal indeed, *thyrso*phorus, and a torchbearer, wordy, like a *Ther*sites), Gregory Neronoff, and others, who also wrote and disseminated a thousand insane falsehoods and fictions, more foul-smelling than all the dung of Augeas' stable, against us [the Greeks, that is]. Indeed before, in the time of Jeremiah patriarch of Constantinople, the Luthero-Calvinists, seeking the

advantage of union with us, and having dared to assert that we symbolised with their blasphemies, when they found by experience that they were attempting what was utterly impossible, wrote a book which they entitled *Turco-Græcia*;—the name alone is enough—as if we Romans, after the lamentable capture of Constantinople, took our opinions from the Turks. God forbid! For, though we sin daily, we have not held up our hands to any strange god, but say with Job: 'The Lord gave us the empire; the Lord has taken it away. He hath done what it pleased him.' Satan has done against us Romans as he did against Job, saying, 'Doth Job serve God for naught? but put forth now thine hand, and touch all that he hath; and truly he will not bless thee to thy face.' So we were stripped of our empire, and deprived of all our varied learning, and other preëminences. But yet we retain the holy religion of our fathers inviolate, and the ancient customs of the Church unchanged. Our four patriarchates, like the four mystical living creatures, still by God's grace and mercy rightly divide the word of truth, preaching unreservedly, and even to blood, as spiritual heralds, clothed with the apostolic orthodox faith as with royal purple, not dyed from shell-fish, but with the blood of martyrs, inasmuch as they remove not irreverently the most sacred traditionary landmarks, nor lay any other foundation than the Lord Jesus Christ, but, honouring as most precious stones the apostles and the divinely-inspired fathers and prophets, keep their traditions even to every iota firm and absolutely uninfringed. Wherefore also, wearing the apostolic orthodoxy as royal purple, we shall appear before the judgment-seat of the Lord, and shall be inheritors of the kingdom of heaven, as having the perfect and genuine mark of his lot and heritage. But away with strife! away with envy too, which is akin to murder! We are even still beautiful, we Romans, strong (*ῥωμάλεοι*) in courage, strong (*ῥωννύμενοι*) in creed, strong (*ἐῤῥωμένοι*) in doctrine, strong (*ῥωμικοὶ*) in mind, though *called* Greeks, and seeming to be Hellenes; so that we are even still able sufficiently to quench the coals with the intellectual moisture of the fiery grace of the Spirit distilling as dew. And avoiding vain questions, we search the most divine scriptures, like diligent miners following the veins of ore, and so finding in them everlasting life. And though here for a short time we suffer, yet we are like the pyragnus,

which grows spontaneously on mount Olympus, as the martyr St. Meletius relates, and which has so much sap and moisture in it, and grows so thick, that it not only is not consumed but, so far as appears, flourishes all the more if a great fire be lighted close round its roots, and made so to burn as that it shall seem to rise out of a well of flames; a striking emblem of pure souls, which from sufferings and anxieties gain Socrates' celebrated oblivion, or the impassibility of Pyrrho. This we Romans so obtain, enduring with a noble and good spirit, like Hercules, like Atlas. But against these presumptuous and heady men who suddenly appeared to originate a pernicious error and a multiplication of wickedness, counterfeiting the ancient manners of the Church, and wholly corrupting the ancestral traditions and customs, while seeming to insist on retaining accredited customs, as if legitimate, who had become the authors of many disturbances, and had filled with unspeakable innovations this great capital, who had by certain human arts and devices successfully economised, and had cloaked the true features of their heterodoxy; for the perpetual confutation and sufficient exposure of this heresy, I say, which had so sprung up and made progress, we, by command of the emperor and of the synod, composed a book, overthrowing point by point the doctrines of Nicetas, that self-constituted divine, who had never imbibed even the first rudiments of theology: and this book was afterwards, in an abridged form, translated into Russ by the hieromonach Simeon, and finally printed for a perpetual memory and everlasting assurance.

CHAP. XXXIII. *Zeal of Paul Metropolitan of Krontitz, Paisius of Gaza, and Hilarion of Riazan, against the Russian innovators.*

When, after his resurrection on the third day, the chief Shepherd and God-man Jesus saw Peter sleeping, he cried out to him, 'Simon, sleepest thou?' as if he had said, 'Awake, thou that sleepest;' for 'it beseems not a man that is a councillor' (as Homer has it) 'to sleep all the night,' especially one who is shepherd of the peoples. 'God said to Moses (Num. xx.): Take Aaron, and Eleazar his son, and bring them up to mount Hor before all the congregation; and put off from Aaron his vestments, and put them upon Eleazar his son: and he did so.' 'Dost thou understand,' cries the thunder-voiced Cyril of Alexandria, 'that Eleazar, who is to receive the high-priesthood, is

taken up to a lofty mountain, visible from on all sides, and illustrious for its glory? Let this then be said to every one who is brought to the holy ministry, that a city cannot be hid that is set on a hill.' An exact type of the bishops is Aaron, whose rod put forth blossoms and nuts, the sweet fruit of the almond. But why, I ask, was the rod of the legal high-priest an almond rod? and why was it preserved, ever remaining in blossom? 'It was a symbol of the just judgment of the bishops,' says the afore-mentioned most learned Cyril, 'whose duty it is to watch constantly, and who are to carry about in themselves nuts (fruit), that is, the most sincere tokens and memorials of their ever-flourishing care.' There is also an old tradition, that our Lord by his question to Peter thrice repeated meant to set him right of his former thrice-repeated denial, saying, 'Peter, lovest thou me?' and that as he said the words, 'Feed my lambs,' 'Feed my sheep,' he gave him a staff significative of pastoral authority. For as Moses, when constituted leader of the people of Israel, received the staff of the patriarch Jacob, which had been inherited by his son Joseph, and after his death had been taken to Pharaoh's palace, and was given by the daughter of Pharaoh the princess Thermoutis [wife of Thothmes] to Moses her adopted son, so Peter also, being put forward from all the sheep of the world, and at once appearing to be, and being called, and indicated as, the mouth of the whole choir of the apostles, receives the charge of being leader of the flock, as Theophylact declares, in meet recompense for the ardour of his love. This staff of the Prince of the Apostles the Christians living at Antioch once upon a time having set up as a conquering standard against the Hagarenes, put to flight 40,000 of them; and afterwards, fighting with all their might, they routed also the remainder of their innumerable forces. Thence it has been the custom for all religious heads of churches and monasteries to carry a staff in their hands, as an emblem of authority and sign of their leadership of the people, as the most learned Simeon of Thessalonica explains, saying thus: 'The staff signifies the power of the Spirit, and the faculty of settling or supporting, and feeding and leading the people, and disciplining the disobedient, and bringing together to himself those that are afar off.' Wherefore also it has at top a double handle like the flukes of an anchor, with which to pursue and hook those who are like wild beasts and mischievous. And

lastly, it exhibits the cross of Christ, and the sign of victory, by which we both conquer, and are supported, and led, and shepherded, and sealed, and drawn to Christ; conquering our passions, putting to flight our enemies; and being ourselves defended from all harm.' Now therefore, there were three bishops, who appeared as true staff-bearers of the Holy Trinity, as foremost in the ranks, and leaders of the attack on the enemy: and their names were Paul, Paisius, and Hilarion. These zealously attacked and refuted those schismatics who were actively disseminating their mischief in different parts, *nominally accusing Nicon, but really holding up to reproach us Romans, as having swerved from orthodoxy* and from the traditionary faith of our fathers, having aimed wide of the mark in matters of conscience, and made shipwreck of the mystery of godliness. These, I say, we irresistibly confuted, proving clearly that *Alleluia* ought to be said *thrice*, as being an emblem and confession of the tripersonal Trinity, according to the divine revelation; also that the divine sign of the cross ought to be made with the first three fingers, as Ignatius Theophorus taught; and farther teaching that men should believe in the Holy Spirit, who is called 'the Lord, and the Spirit of Truth;' and a multitude of other points, as they were defined afterwards in the synodical articles, and as we shall relate and set forth hereafter with more detail.

Chap. XXXIV. *Announcement of the approach of the Patriarchs.*

To relate in detail the long and varied journeyings of these two most blessed patriarchs, how they were invited by our most excellent emperor, and set forth, leaving their own chairs and patriarchates, I leave to others who may be disposed to write accounts of such details. It will be enough for me to say only thus much, that they passed by a country of mountains and precipices, without roads, and suffered a thousand hardships and perils as they passed by the mountains of Georgia (Iberia), reaching thence with difficulty the cities of Persia; that from thence they went through the Gates, as they are called, of Alexander, which he devised as a security in that spot [the Iron Gates of the Caucasus, on the side of the Caspian Sea], and crossed the Breasts of the North [the range of the Caucasus]. Many months before they actually arrived the much-desired coming of the

patriarchs was announced at Moscow. For the patriarch of Antioch, Kyr Macarius, as has already been related, was in the illustrious Iberias [*i.e.* in the countries of the Georgians]; and learning that his brother and fellow-minister Kyr Paisius of Alexandria was awaiting him in the Persian city of Tiflis, he departed out of Mingrelia, which is at the top on the Black Sea, and having opened a communication with Kyr Paisius, they agreed together that the patriarch of Alexandria should go on to Samach (another city of Persia), but the patriarch of Antioch should remain yet a short time, for certain affairs of his own, until the arrival [at Samach] of the emperor's vessel. So he departed from Tiflis (so called[22] from the hot springs there) April 4, A.D. 1665, with much fear and laborious precautions, running off as a fugitive to the precipices of Mount Taurus, and, together with them that rode with him, joined Kyr Paisius on Easter-day (15th of April). And there they tarried a while, expecting the vessel that should come for them from Astrachan. When the ship was announced, they all went down to the shore of the Caspian Sea, which stretches parallel to the Euxine, and is like a lake without any exit. And it was because nature had here made spontaneously something like such a gate as might be made by man that the *Caspian* Gate and the *Caspian* Sea were so named of old, according to Procopius. And both the patriarchs, having with their company and with their loaded camels ridden down, alighted, and remained there a few days, waiting for a fair wind; which having at length obtained, they lost no time, but sailed at once. And when they were half way on their voyage, they met another larger ship of the emperor's, to which some part of their company was transhipped, so to give them more room (for before they were terribly crowded and inconvenienced). And now they were abundantly supplied with all that they needed: they had plenty of provisions: only the water failed them; and so they were tormented with insatiable thirst, the wind having changed so as no longer to be favourable: and they suffered so much distress that they were forced to send the ship's boat ashore. But the whole line of the coast was watched by the famous Koumoukids, a race of cruel and fierce-looking men, living constantly by forays, and carrying off captives and cattle and property from their neighbours, thinking from of old time any

[22] *Tepli* in Slavonic and Russ means 'hot.'

loss and calamity which may befall mariners to be the greatest good luck in the world for themselves. These people wounded with their missiles three of the sailors, who were simply seeking to take in water. They succeeded, however, in bringing off, at the expense of some blood, a little of the water, as much as sufficed to save them from perishing by thirst. But after no great number of days from this time they entered the great river Volga, from which in former times the Bulgarians were named, as having come from it: and there remaining, they were satiated to the full with abundance of all good things, especially of most sweet and excellent fish, and with the finest sterlets (*σπαράγγων*), though the multitude of mosquitoes was such that they were forced to sit continually under mosquito-nets. So presently setting forth again on their way, in high spirits, as now, by God's merciful grace, having got safe through all the dangers and storms, they arrived and moored at Astrachan, a city with very handsome walls, where the archbishop Joseph came out to receive them with a splendid procession (*λιτή*), his hieromonachs standing in a circle round him, and carrying the holy icons and the holy gospels adorned with jewels and pearls, and other sacred vessels and treasures, all clad in their full sacerdotal attire. So all the clergy hastened to meet them; and the common people, together with the clergy, to do their reverence to them, as well as for the pleasure of the sight, occupying the most convenient places of the streets for seeing the splendid entry of the most holy patriarchs to the city. The most illustrious voivode also came (he happened to be the prince James, son of the most noble boyar Nikita), together with the most noble boyars of his suite; and having paid the due salutation to the patriarchs, and having received their blessing, he walked before them, and conducted them to the monastery with great joy, amid the ringing of all the bells of all sizes from all sides, as on any high festival (and before that he had saluted the patriarchs on their arrival with the discharge of firearms and artillery); and so he introduced them to the lodgings which had long before been prepared for them. Such was the honourable meeting and reception which the most blessed patriarchs had from the inhabitants of Astrachan. After their arrival at Astrachan (where their allowances for their support were appointed to all of them) they rested a short space in continual hospitalities, feastings, and civilities, and

then were appointed all to proceed in carriages belonging to the emperor. So the patriarchs set forth from the city of Astrachan, and came to Simbirsk; and thence by land they travelled forty days' journey: and whereas the roads were difficult to pass, and very wet and miry, they were levelled and made good by the emperor's command, and furnished with new bridges; so that the roads were found level, and the streets making a good appearance everywhere.

CHAP. XXXV. *Salutation by the Grandees in the Emperor's name.*

And now in the mean time there were sent two of the grandees, as on the emperor's behalf, to offer to the patriarchs the due salutation and welcome, bearing letters also full of expressions of satisfaction. Here I think I ought to insert the text of these letters, as not containing anything improper to publish, or any state secrets of the emperor, such as it is honourable to conceal, according to the words of Solomon. These letters too [like other documents mentioned in this work] were translated from the Slavonic into Greek by the most learned διδάσκαλος Epiphanius, as follows:

Letter of the Emperor to Kyr Paisius, Pope and Patriarch of Alexandria [abridged in the English].

'By the grace of God, we, Alexis Michaelovich, &c. [the fullest title] to the most blessed and most reverend bishop and most all-holy pope and patriarch of Alexandria and œcumenical judge, Kyr Paisius, &c. wishing all earthly and heavenly blessings from the first and greatest bishop (high-priest) Jesus Christ our Saviour, who has ascended into the heavens.' [Then an amazing cloud of verbiage, expressing affection and reverence, welcome and joy, at having previously received the patriarch's letters, and thanks to God] 'for having preserved you through all the perils and hardships of the journey, and brought you safe to Russia, considering the right purpose of your beatitude, that you might be able through such your salutary passage [to Russia] to contend against and *to subdue them that oppose piety, and to support and defend them that adhere firmly to the sincere faith*. . . . . and has directed hither the beautiful feet of thy beatitude, whose mind for acuteness in theology is like an eagle

which can gaze unblenching on the sun, to announce to us the gospel (the good tidings) of fair peace, in imitation of Christ and his apostles; that thou mayest have the blessings both *of them that thirst after justice*, and *of them that are persecuted for the truth and are called by every evil name for Christ's sake*; for whom *alone* also thou hast undertaken and gone through all these hardships and labours, in spite of thine age and infirmities. But in truth there is laid up for thee, in recompense for [all these thy noble labours in behalf of the orthodox religion and the apostolic Church] which the angels desire to look into, the unfading crown of righteousness. Christ himself shall reward thee an hundredfold, and give thee moreover everlasting life. Wherefore we now welcome thy most anxiously-desired arrival as if it were the presence of an angel from heaven heralding to us a flowery spring, dispersing every cloud of dissatisfaction, dissolving every storm of most heavy winter which has overclouded the rational flock, and, in brief, to dispel all the thick night of painful circumstances. So may the most holy Trinity &c. preserve and direct thy inward and outward man for many years; and grant to our empire, through thy prevailing prayers and intercessions, that thy dealing with us may be propitious, thy advance favourable, and thine entrance advantageous. Amen. So be it. Given in the imperial palace of Moscow, A.M. 7175, A.D. 1666, Sept. 14th.

'But since our majesty feels the utmost anxiety for the health of thy beatitude, we have personally sent with these present letters Peter Sabbich Khitroff, by rank a nobleman of our palace, to inquire after the health of your all-holiness, hoping that you may arrive as prosperously and as speedily as possible at this our capital.

'I, Alexis emperor, who thirst for the life-flowing blessing of thy beatitude, and for the delight of seeing thee, together with my consort the empress Maria, and all my sisters and dearest children, all affectionately salute thee, and devoutly adore the Lord.'

Another like letter the potent emperor Kyr Alexis wrote also to the patriarch of Antioch, Kyr Macarius, which is by no means to be omitted from this our history, as it shows so signally the great care, reverence, and attention with which our emperor regarded and welcomed the two œcumenical patriarchs. This letter was couched in the following terms:

Letter of the Emperor to Kyr Macarius Patriarch of Antioch.

'We, Alexis Michaelovich, by the providence, mercy, and grace of God, great hossoudar (*μέγας αὐθέντης*), emperor (*βασιλεὺς*), and grand prince (*μέγας κνέζης*) of Great, Little, and White Russia, &c. &c. to the most blessed and hypersuperlatively most reverend Kyr Macarius, patriarch of the city of God Antioch and of all the East, archpastor of the holy catholic and apostolic Church of Christ, wishing love, peace, health and salvation, &c.

'The near approach of all the good we have been so long expecting greatly gladdens our religious mind. For thy natural meekness and generosity of mind, adorned with orthodox doctrine, and the sleepless care which thou takest for the rational sheep of Christ, exceeds all virtue, abounds above all grace. Wherefore we have long been looking for thy presence with all our soul, eagerly desiring to see with our own eyes thy pastoral or rather angelic countenance. Whence from the day that we received thy all-worshipful letters we were greatly delighted, &c. to be informed of the health of your all-holiness, who labourest so zealously in behalf of Christ's Church, yea, and leadest all to piety: whence the praise of thy great name flourishes; and we feel confidence that through thy beatitude *the present scandals will cease, and the storm now agitating the Church be turned to a calm.* What has been already done by thy most wise high-priesthood excites vast admiration among all tribes of men. Thy laborious journeyings will long be celebrated with praises; thy firmness of purpose, the anxieties, the hardships which thou hast endured from vicissitudes of weather and seasons, from change of place, while conducted as a stranger from one place to another, following the steps of Jesus Christ, and being like Paul, who, beginning from Jerusalem, went about even to Illyricum announcing the gospel of Christ. Thus also thy beatitude with exact emulation of the zeal of Paul, who was caught up into the third heaven, hast performed this long and laborious journey solely to arrive in our empire. So soon, then, as the news of thy courage, firmness, and generosity reached the ears of our majesty, we were lifted up on the wings of hope, which made us think it not unbecoming to receive thee even as another Paul, with the confidence that through thy all-holy tongue, *which brings, as it were,*

a beam of olive-wood in thy mouth, thou wilt announce to us that much-desired *peace*, for the sake of settling which *alone* thou hast performed all this long journey. God grant that the holy features of thy pontifical countenance may shine upon us, as we most earnestly desire to see it, as speedily as possible. We pray that thy all-holiest beatitude may enjoy health of soul and body, with all other blessings, &c. Written at the imperial court of Moscow, A.M. 7175, A.D. 1666, Sept. 14th.

'We have been pleased to send on this present service Peter Sabbich Khitroff, to go and inquire after the health of your all-holiness, yea, and to add that our majesty wishes that you may arrive as prosperously and as soon as possible at Moscow.'

CHAP. XXXVI. *Arrival of the two most blessed Patriarchs.*

The most blessed patriarchs having come within a short distance of Moscow, the emperor, our good entertainer of strangers, sent out a variety of presents to them, with a profusion worthy of his imperial magnificence, and cast, as it were, to them a bunch of roses significative of friendship, in the following letter:

Letter of the Emperor to the two œcumenical Patriarchs.

'We, Alexis, &c. to the all-holiest supersuperlatively reverend and most blessed bishops and chief pastors of the rational sheep of Christ, Kyr Paisius pope and patriarch of Alexandria and œcumenical judge, and Kyr Macarius patriarch of Antioch and all the East, the orthodox and catholic helmsmen of our all-holy mother and *mistress* the Church, praying all protection from our Lord Jesus Christ: The apostle who was caught up to the third heaven has declared that *divine love* is the beginning and end of all particular commandments of piety. Wherefore our imperial majesty, having learned to ascend to the continuous steps of the virtues, desires with cordiality and much love to see your all-holiness, which is above all honour, closely joined with ourselves, and to be able to confer with you on those matters which are of the utmost importance, *having continually in our thoughts that saying, He that receiveth you receiveth me.* This saying it is which has moved us, though you are still only on the way, to send to you in token of our inward affection, and for the most perfect completion of inward virtue. Moreover, we have sent a trusty officer of superior rank, one who is used to attend

in our imperial court, the general and colonel Artemon Sergievich [Matveëff], a man of highly approved ability and fidelity in matters of state, to attend upon your holinesses on the way; and we have instructed him to show the utmost zeal and diligence in rendering you all other service and assistance, and in furnishing and preparing whatever may be useful or becoming for your journey to Moscow. He also will bring certain presents with him, to refresh and comfort you, as far as may be, after the hardships and fatigues of your long journey, full of toils, pains, and great perils, with which you must be worn out and exhausted, and which you have gone through as athletes for the sake of Christ's Church, and *solely* for its peace and settlement *unto edification*. The most high God grant in recompense for all your pains and labours and tribulations endured *for Him*, health to your beatitudes for the confirmation of the faith of his holy Name, and for the making clear of his unspeakable majesty. Amen. So be it. Written from the imperial court in our capital city of Moscow, A.M. 7175, A.D. 1666, Oct. 13.

'The emperor Alexis with all his house suppliantly and reverently implores and begs your prayers, blessing, and pardon.'

Epilogue.

The patriarchs then, encouraged by these letters, went forward with joy, and all prepared for their meeting and reception. One single individual alone, which was Nicon, was troubled and annoyed, considering the uncertainty and the unfavourableness of the prospect for himself. Prometheus was not wounded by so many bites of the vulture at his liver, Æneas was not assailed by so many doubts and fears, as Nicon's heart now stuck itself full of questionings (ἐνεπορπώσατο), cloaking itself (ἐγκομβωθεῖσα), gasconading on this side and on that; as a wide-throated big-winged sea-gull flying round about: and, as Etna with spontaneous belchings of fire lights up into flames, so his heart at one moment was dark with anxieties as covered with ashes, and at the next blazed up into a flame. As an ox at the altar, so his soul was used inwardly to be oppressed, and to melt as wax, being heated red-hot with fiery darts of anxieties, like a bush set on fire on all sides, and hedged in with pricking thoughts as with needles. But here let the torrent of our narrative stop, swollen though it be, and roughened as to its stream by storms

of wind and rain. But let us flee, O friends, the rough surge and the rising waves of the working sea: for, lo, the peace of a clear sky makes a way; the stream, suiting itself to our wishes, becomes calm; the storm suddenly clears off into fair weather; all becomes tranquil and genial; that storm-demon which had before indignantly sought to cast us, though sailing in the ship against our will, like Jonas of old into the sea [being himself cast out in our stead]. From this moment the breaths of zephyrs, the equinoctial gales (*ἰσημερινὰ αὔραι*, but he means rather summer breezes) of the spirit blow about us, and succeed to the storm. Already the halcyon days, dawning after the many tumults and tempests which were dashing against the churches, have breathed in upon us a breath of peace and refreshment; the happy petals of blushing flowers rise smilingly, bursting under the influence of the spring zephyrs; and the grasshoppers, finding their voices again, fill the ear of them that are lovers of piety, and that are nourished by spiritual songs; and the nightingales with their sweet notes, warbling their siren melodies and swan-like quavers and strains, excite the people that are in their prime to give glory and to sing hymns to God. Wherefore, this only is the introduction and the sum of unmarred happiness, that for the night mourning shall lie out of doors unsheltered, but the morning shall be joy.

END OF THE FIRST BOOK.

Book II.

Introduction [abridged].

As St. Gregory the Divine enumerates three removals of polity or dispensation, which the scripture calls earthquakes, as David, 'The earth did quake,' &c., and Paul, 'Yet once more I will shake not the earth only,' &c.; the first being the change from idolatry to the law, in which the Father is revealed, but the Son and the Spirit only hinted; the second that from the law to the gospel, in which the Son is revealed, and through him the Holy Ghost; the third that which is yet to come, when this world passes away from our present darkness to the full

vision of the Trinity,—so we also have proposed to exhibit three ecclesiastical earthquakes of removal, of which we have already explained and shown the first, in the distinct abdication of Nicon made in presence of the Church. So we have still to relate the second earthquake, which is the patriarchal judgment pronounced against Nicon; and the third and last, which we shall show to have been his final deposition, and the regular election of a new patriarch, Kyr Joachim. Now then we proceed to the second earthquake, which is vastly greater and more complete than the first; and so we shall in due time come to the third, the last in order, but the first in weight and importance, and shall set it forth as it deserves, adorned with divers patriarchical sentences, as with sweet-scented flowers, and coloured over with multifarious ideas of different times.

CHAP. I. *Arrival of the Patriarchs, and how they were first met with an address of welcome.*

The patriarchs were now close at hand; and on the 2d Nov. were to make their entry. But who can describe the universal joy? All the city poured out to meet them. Early on that morning the emperor sent Hilarion archbishop of Riazan, and two distinguished archimandrites, with an imperial carriage to meet the patriarchs; and he, as a man of eloquence and education, welcomed them thus: 'To-day all the land of Russia is filled with joy, O most holy lords, fathers, and archpastors! To-day the bodily presence of your all-holiness beams like the blazing rays of the sun upon the Russian Church, and promises to us all joy. To-day *on the tempest-tost and well-nigh foundering ship of our patriarchate* zephyrs of calm begin to breathe, &c. *The seventh year* [the eighth, from 10 July A.D. 1658] *has now passed* that we all have been expecting this fair weather to bring a calm. In this our speech there is no flattery. Your coming will be for these northern parts as the morning dawn bringing light after thick darkness. The visible heaven indeed is adorned with the greater light of the sun and the lesser light of the moon, but the intellectual heaven of Christ's Church has you revolving in it as two great luminaries, two mystic suns, far exceeding the light of the moon. For in very truth *ye* are the light of the world, the most brilliant luminaries of the universe, not hidden under the bushel, but set in the candlestick of your

most exalted chairs to lighten the peculiar people [of God]. Whence also from the splendour of your virtues and graces we expect the happiest effects. For the Prince of our salvation has said, Where two or three are met together *in my name*, there am I in the midst of them. And we feel the more sure that we shall obtain *that peace which we long for* through your all-holiness, as we well know that wherever ye say, Peace and blessing to *them that are worthy*, immediately peace ensues, according to the unfailing words of Jesus Christ. This peace we thirst for, as the hart thirsts for the waterbrooks. . . . . Come then, lift up your hands and give peace, O most blessed patriarchs, to our most entirely religious and Christ-loving great hossoudar and mighty emperor Kyr Kyr Alexis Michaelovich, auguring and announcing to him *that peace which God loves*, to set up *trophies of victory over his enemies*, and praying that he may have health of soul and body with all his house, and length of days, with all good things that can be asked as profitable to the soul in abundance, the enjoyment of everlasting life, the years of Methuselah: and we will all say, Amen, Amen.'

CHAP. II. *Entry of the Patriarchs into Moscow.*

Outside the outer walls of the city the metropolitan of Kroutitz Paul went forth with a great number of priests, all in full robes: and he too spoke an address of welcome to the patriarchs, though, what with the multitude of the people and the narrowness of the bridge, he was so thronged that scarcely a word was audible.

'Hail' (he said), 'ye who have gladdened the whole Russian Church, O most holy patriarchs! Rejoice ever in the Lord, ye who have done his will, *and fulfilled the duty of superintending the flock*, in that from your lofty watch-tower regarding also this flock, ye made haste to stretch out a helping hand by coming hither so soon as ye had certainly learned what straits oppressed *it*, distracted as it was and wandering hither and thither, *owing to the transgression of its shepherd* and his *most gross neglect*. In truth, the office of the good shepherd is to apply mollifying ointment to those sheep that are diseased, to bind up the wounds of the wounded, to carry the weak on his shoulders, and to lead them to the rich pasture, to a place of herbage, to waters of refreshment. And ye, as imitators of the chief shepherd Christ,

seeking *not at all* your own interest, but regarding *only the common good* of Christ's Church, have come hither with speed. Wherefore also we rejoice with all our hearts, and venerate the steps of your blessed feet. Of old the shepherds who kept watch in the field hastened to Bethlehem, which is by interpretation the house of bread,[1] and there presenting their gifts adored the babe laid in the manger: and now the chief shepherd himself, Jesus, has moved you, as shepherds who were not slumbering, to come to the great city of Moscow: whom we with all reverence greet and welcome; and coming forth to receive you we bear with us, as a standard, the most venerable icon which has upon it Christ as a child and his Mother, the mother of God, for a manifest token[2] and abiding succour. Also we raise aloft and carry to meet you the life-giving cross, the victory-bringing sign of piety, the thrice-happy symbol; that, through this most imperial emblem of the cross preceding and leading you, you may make an auspicious entry. Come then, and, as with all reverence we bend our heads, give us your prelatical blessing, pronouncing *the beloved Peace* both to the city, and to the house, and to all the Christian people,' &c. &c.

First there was borne the imperial standard, the double-headed eagle; and with it a splendid glass lantern, with wax lights lighted, led the way, and a huge cross of crystal firmly held aloft. And after many inferior clerks, who had gone first, a body of priests not easily to be counted followed, and a great number of archimandrites, some going first others following; and after them came last, like most brilliant stars, the two most holy patriarchs, wearing their mandyas, their epitrachelia, and their omophoria, the emblems of their episcopal power. And when the patriarchs were come near to the second wall, they were met by the metropolitan of Rostoff Jonah, with a number of bishops and archimandrites. Again, somewhat nearer [to the Kremlin], they were awaited in the round platform [before the church of Vasili Blajenni] by other bishops and archimandrites, and by the metropolitan of Kazan Laurentius; and he also had an address ready. Last of all, the metropolitan of Novgorod, Pitirim, was waiting for them in the cathedral, with the remainder of the

[1] So it should be, ἄρτου· but in the MS. it is ἄρκτου, *i. e.* the house of the north, or of the bear.

[2] The icon called Známenski.

senior metropolitans and the archimandrites of the first rank. And when the two patriarchs had come up close we all went forth from the great church to meet them, and the metropolitan Pitirim delivered the following address:

'David of old danced and leaped before the ark when he saw it coming into his own city of holy Sion; and so now our emperor Alexis Michaelovich, &c., clothed not only outwardly with white robes but inwardly with the splendid purple of orthodoxy, dances and leaps with joy to see in this his city you, the living arks, containing the divine oracles of the gospel doctrine and rivers of life welling up from your breasts, and carrying that mystical manna itself which the Holy Ghost gives to him that overcometh (τῷ νικῶντι). He knows that you are not only a candle showing your good works to the glory of God, but also the very light itself, according to the word of the Saviour, who said, Ye are the light of the world. We see you now in your own persons, holding in your hands the pastoral staff by which the rational sheep are governed, and the wolves driven away from the fold. Or rather our emperor expects that the new sowers of tares shall be broken by that your staff as a potter's vessel. Wherefore he rejoices, and with him the most illustrious synclete of the nobles exults, and all the multitude of the Christians shares their joy, at the happy prospect of the deliverance of the Russian Church, which is now wearing, contrary to all reason, the mourning garments of *widowhood*. Yea, this great city of Moscow, as a ship tossed by tempests, hopes to attain to a calm haven through your serene coming, and that the whirlwinds of Boreas now bursting on her so fiercely will cease, when there shall have been made *that election which is to be wished* of some excellent man capable of coping with the dragon, which has now vomited out so fierce a flood, through certain boors ignorant of the old doctrines, and transgressors of the primitive rules. And we hope that the bride of Christ, the holy Church, may be clothed with the sun of justice, and her brow circled with a diadem, not of jewels, but of twelve stars, which are the twelve articles of the creed as dictated by the twelve apostles; and that this great house of the city of Moscow may be swept clean from the pollutions of wretched heterodoxy, adorned with the beauty (φιλοκαλήματι) of piety, sprinkled with the aspersion of infallible truth, yea, and fenced round with the traditionary oracles of the Eastern Church, tried

in the fire, and made whiter than snow, of which we also are true sons, close followers, fellow disciples and companions, as she walks by the straight road and rightly divides the word of truth. Come then, O come, and supplicating all together the one God who in three persons is worshipped and glorified, let us cry out: Establish, O God, our most serene emperor and most mighty prince, Kyr Kyr Alexis Michaelovich, monocrat of all Great, Little, and White Russia, and guard him, together with the most religious empress the lady and mistress Maria Ilichna, with their sons the most honourable hossoudars Alexis, Theodore, Simeon, and John Alexievich, and all the imperial princesses, and all the palace, and the Christian people. Give them peace and strength; break the power of the barbarous nations; yea, and subject them, for the spread of orthodoxy. . . . , And ye, who bring to us *the hope of a peaceable settlement of the Church*, or rather who by coming as moderators are yourselves pledges of it, would that in this present life ye could enjoy the same! At any rate, in the life to come may ye inherit the heavenly and everlasting mansions. . . . . And may ye hear with joy that most desirable and divine voice saying to each, Well done, good and faithful servant; enter thou into the joy of thy Lord!'

After this address we went into the great church with all reverence; and the patriarchs, after the customary salutation of the icons, while the singers sang the Ἄξιον ἐστίν, κ.τ.λ. went and stood in the middle of the church, where were two low seats (with a cushion) set upon two carpets, as for some small distinction, and there having remained a short time [in prayer], they returned thanks briefly to all the bishops present in appropriate words; for it was not possible, after all the fatigue they had gone through, and when the day was so far spent, to indulge in eloquence after the Asiatic fashion. So we all kissed their hands; and the patriarchs, getting into the imperial carriages which were ready for them, went away to the metóchi (the lodge) of the Cyrilloff monastery, where their lodgings were prepared for them. And, after they had rested awhile, a handsome entertainment was served to them in their cells.

Chap. III. *Audience of the Patriarchs.*

After two days our emperor invited the patriarchs to an audience; and they went, that day being Sunday, taking with

them many presents of foreign articles, and varieties of all the productions of Egypt, Damascus, Iberia, and all the region of the East, and of Arabia, and whatever Thrace produces that is in request and portable. And when they were come near to the golden hall (the zólotaya palata) of the emperor's palace, there came out to meet them in splendid apparel all the synclete; and the two patriarchs, having both together said over them the usual prayer, and having blessed them, after many civilities and welcomes, uttered the following address [here abridged]:

'O Lord Almighty, king and ruler of the universe, strengthen the arm of our heaven-crowned emperor Kyr Kyr Alexis Michaelovich of Moscow, &c.; give him strength invincible against all his enemies visible and invisible; as thou didst strengthen David against Goliath, and Constantine against the tyrant Maxentius: for in thee, O emperor, after God, we trust to be delivered, according to the import of thy name: for the name Alexius is interpreted to mean an averter of evils, a defender, a new *Alexander*, putting to flight all attacking barbarians, pursuing and driving away all tyrants, enemies of Christ. From which oppressions may we be delivered and rescued, O Christ our king, who hast written on thee the title, King of kings and Lord of lords. And may he, who is the Paraclete and the giver of life, give to thee, O emperor, life for the longest term, make thee to reign many years, to extreme old age, *for the confirmation of the ecclesiastical firmament*, for the increase of the people of Christ, for the joy of our undecaying race, and for the everlasting honour of the Russian nation: Whom now we bless, and sanctify, and glorify for ever and ever. Amen.'

To which the emperor replied: 'If ever there was a time, now is the time to sing that psalm of thanksgiving of the king and prophet David: Our God is in heaven; and in earth the Lord hath done whatsoever pleaseth him (Ps. cxiii.). And he indeed, the forefather according to the flesh of Christ our God, considering the many and great miracles wrought in the exodus of the Hebrews, ceased not to hymn them; but I dwell on the goodness and mercy of my Redeemer and Creator in that benefit and grace which he has now given me, beyond all hope and expectation, in your honourable and most useful coming. In truth I am hereby made more a debtor—I am at once placed under a greater obligation—than were the ungrateful Jews when

they were freed from the bondage of Pharaoh. In truth now I have a good hope and confident expectation that through you deliverance from her bondage will be brought to our Russian Church, which now is held and oppressed by the most grievous tribulations and difficulties, like that woman (in the gospel) who was bowed down with her plague. For I trust that she too shall hear that word, Woman, thou art loosed of thy plague; that is, that, after she has received your more solemn prayer and most sacred blessing, she shall be raised and set upright who in time past *was deserted for some secret and unknown sins;* yea, and she shall glorify the Most High with joy, dwelling in the hope of the eighth year[3] and age,[4] and looking in it for the keeping of the commandments of the decalogue, and for the fulfilment of the whole of the divine law.[5] Believe me, O divinely-promoted patriarchs, that that Berenice[6] to whom I have alluded never went to so many expenses, nor tried so many ways to be cured of her bodily disease, as I have pursued methods, mediations, and economies, for healing that spiritual disorder which has attacked our Church. And this one only chance, namely that of obtaining your presence, was still left to me as a last anchor, through which I confidently trust that she shall obtain the desired cure, and be delivered from her bloody flux, by touching even the hems of your garments: for grace in very deed and power goes out from you, and heals all those that approach with faith. But, being at this point of my address, I am at a loss with what to begin and with what to end my welcome. What, O what, shall I even call you, O most divine pastors, and three times most blessed? Shall I call you apostles? Ye *are* apostles in the truest sense, as being truly called their successors. And thou for one, O pope and patriarch Kyr Paisius, art not so much the successor of the evangelist Mark, the adopted son and beloved nephew of the chief prince of the apostles, as the true successor of Peter himself, who was *petrified* into the adamantine rock of the faith, in that, though aged, thou hast gone forth from thy patriarchal throne, even as a bright flash of lightning, to scatter all the mist and darkness of error, heeding not the pains and dangers of such long journeyings, but looking only to

[3] That is, since Nicon's retirement; but it was now really the *ninth* year.
[4] That is, the eighth millennium, or great year of the world.
[5] Which should be *charity*. [6] The woman in the gospel.

the straight and equal rule of right and justice, and the steadfastness of unerring piety. And thou again, O most *blessed*[1] Macarius, who hast in thyself by anticipation a pledge of the most happy blessedness, in truth as well as in name *Macarius*, blessed imitator and follower of the apostle Luke of Antioch, who has related that in Antioch the first-fruits of the gospel were first named Christians! thou hast both received by inheritance his acts, and hast imitated his zeal, following in the steps of the apostle Paul; and thou hast journeyed over the land, and hast ploughed the sea. That glorious confession of Peter, for which he was called blessed (*μακάριος*), thou hast kept undefiled and unaltered, notwithstanding the fierce attacks of all adversaries, with all thy mind and soul fighting against them. Welcome then, O mighty lights, which shine in equal renown of authority, and excel in equal preëminence of dignity, O mystical yoke of the Spirit, holy pair, turtles dear to my soul, lovely pigeons, a double-headed eagle; the one the most laborious ox, the other the lion, the most generous and royal of beasts. Again, and again, welcome! But, as I know what labours ye have undergone, I am assured that you will be abundantly rewarded for them both in this world, and in the next. Amen. So be it.'

After some considerable time the patriarchs, having been thus cordially welcomed, proceeded to the church to hear the sacred liturgy. It was celebrated on that occasion by Philaret archimandrite of Vladimir, with some others of the secondary rank, that so the benediction might be given by the patriarchs. And, having given it, they returned home.

CHAP. IV. *Adoration (or homage) of the Bishops, and separate presentations of gifts by the Archimandrites. Address from the Metropolitan of Gaza.*

The next day the emperor sent to the patriarchs the customary presents of welcome . . . And the day after that the bishops of the different sees came; and, kissing the hands of the patriarchs, presented them some with gilded icons, others with silver cups, and other pledges of good will. And after them the archimandrites, and other heads of monasteries, came in like manner. The metropolitan of Gaza also came, and delivered an address as follows:

[1] Translating the name Macarius, which means blessed.

'What shall I call you? heavenly men, or earthly angels? who have brightened the heaven, and have made a heaven of earth, that is, of the holy Church; and have adorned it with your good works as with stars, with your doctrines as with elements, with your virtues as with spring flowers,' &c. &c. [Then he expatiates with nonsense about the trees, the olive, the fig, the vine, the bramble, the willow, and the rhamnus, and their significations; and concerning the four rivers of Paradise being emblematic of the four patriarchates. Afterwards he proceeds thus]: 'In truth, the patriarchs of the universe were invited not once only but twice to Moscow: and the letters of the emperor requesting this great charity had been made out, and would before have been sent and delivered, had not the serpent of envy, creeping in, and, having a great jealousy of this general assembly of the evergreen trees, interposed obstacles, and hindered it with his evil eye; like Cronus, and the Gorgons, and Medusa. Nevertheless ye two, of your compassion, have come; the olive of Alexandria and the vine of Antioch; to reign here, and to supply abundantly oil and wine to this wounded people, which has fallen into the hands of robbers visible and invisible, pouring into its wounds abundantly wine and oil, like the charitable Samaritan. Yea, O shepherds of shepherds, fathers of fathers, take pity on this flock; *take pity on the Russians, your children.* Yea, yea, O bishops of bishops, with your archieratical staff direct us; stablish us all; and guide us, as vigilant helmsmen of the universal Church, to a fair haven, to a calm and sheltered anchorage; for doing which ye shall receive *both here a reward* an hundredfold, and in the world to come everlasting life, &c. &c. Amen, Amen.'

Hereupon the patriarchs said: 'Thou hast gladdened us with thy good words, which have come forth from thy treasury of things old and new; and thou hast already raised our expectation by thy golden tongue, which thou usest as a well-tuned instrument of music. Wherefore we thank thee, and we respond to thy good wishes with fraternal prayers and benedictions. May the angel of the Lord go before thee, keeping thee in all thy ways, placing ever steps of ascent in thy heart, carrying thee on from virtue to virtue, and giving thee that which is above all, namely, a good end!' &c. &c.

CHAP. V. *Other addresses to the two Patriarchs.*

It was the hour for dinner, and there came four youths from Theodosius the metropolitan of Servia, bearing four dishes filled with divers meats: and of these boys the first made a speech as follows:

'Among the oaths of the Pythagoreans, O most blessed patriarchs, there was one, "Yea, by the number four," or "Nay, by the number four, which pleases our soul, and contains the roots of ever-springing nature." Now what was it which these sages intended to hint by the number four? Opinions differed; but the prevailing interpretation was, that the four things were the four elements of fire, air, water, and earth; and this last also, according to Homer, was divided into four parts, which should be Asia, Europe, Africa, and America, the new country of the antipodes: and of these we are even ourselves composed: wherefore Empedocles called them the seeds of life. Also the name of God, consisting [in Hebrew] of four letters, and in most nations [as in Θεὸς and Deus] expressed by four letters, may be understood under the same Pythagorean tetrad, which also indicates those four roots which are *βυθὸς*, *σιγὴ*, *νοῦς*, and *ἀλήθεια*. This might well be asserted by a wise and judicious man: but hear, I pray you, by the Graces, what my fellows may have to say.'

The second of the youths then advancing, spoke thus: 'The king Nebuchadnezzar saw in his dream four beasts diverse and portentous; which Daniel explains to be the four empires of the Babylonians, the Persians, the Greeks, and the Romans: and it pleased the divine Word not to be incarnate in any other than in the auspicious time of the most noble Romans. But why, thou wilt ask, was this so? Doubtless, that the most powerful Romans might execute just vengeance on the Jews for the murder of Christ, taking them prisoners of war, and selling thirty of these same Jews, in vengeance for Him who was sold for thirty pieces of silver, for one silver coin, as the most exact Hebrew historian Josephus relates. The Romans, besides, afforded some sort of facility for the preaching of the gospel over all the world. Besides which, the religious emperors of the Romans, Constantine, Marcian, and Theodosius, caused the faith to be made clear, and supported orthodoxy: as also at the present day our divinely graced emperor Alexis, the universal and legitimate successor of

the Roman emperors, supports the Church of Christ and defends it, like another Cesar, wielding a two-edged sword against the adversaries of the Church and the empire. And so you have the whole explanation. This was the reason. Also, because the Romans, according to the sense of their name itself in the Roman tongue, were *strong*, valiant, altogether noble, and in all ways distinguished. I have spoken according to the measure of my capacity' [ending with the quotation of a Greek iambic line].

The third boy then made his speech thus: 'Let others say what they please; I think that by the tetrad must be meant the four divine gospels of the four inspired evangelists, the four mystical rivers of the Church in the East, the Pison, Gihon, Tigris, and Euphrates, which flow round and water the four-quartered world. And three precious stones are possessed by Pison, which is Matthew, because he has revealed to us the great mystery of the Trinity, in the words, "Go and make disciples of all nations, baptising them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost:" into which faith we have all been baptised, and [in it] are saved. It would be too long to speak of the other three symbolical rivers; and the subject far exceeds my capacity. So I hold my peace with Pythagoras, who forbids such as I am to speak for five years.'

The fourth boy, who was shorter and smaller than any of the rest, now came forward: his name was Orestes. 'Ye have all,' he said, 'O my companions, spoken extremely well; nevertheless I will utter the *whole* truth. This divine and holy tetrad means properly *yourselves*, the holy œcumenical patriarchs: and the fourfold great beasts or living creatures which the prophet saw are regarded by the prophets, as by Ezekiel in his visions, thus: the eagle as mystically representing the throne of the patriarchate of Constantinople, the lion that of Alexandria, the calf that of Antioch, and the man that of Jerusalem. Also the lioness of the Babylonians symbolised the chair of Peter the first hierarch of Antioch, to which also was subject the city of Babylon, and which was studded round with one hundred and fifty great chairs, answering to the number of fishes caught in a certain haul. The bear of the Persians signifies the chair of Jerusalem, which suffered there the bitter captivity of 400 years and more. The leopard of the Greeks signified very clearly the great see of Alexandria. The fourth beast, the multiform, won-

derful, and terrible beast of Rome, signifies the enviable and lofty chair of new Rome. So again fire signifies the see of Constantinople, water that of Alexandria, air that of Antioch, and earth that of Jerusalem. And these chairs have for their patrons the four great angelic captains (ταξιάρχας); that of C.P. St. Michael, that of Alexandria Gabriel, that of Antioch Raphael, and that of Ælia Uriel. Rightly therefore and to the purpose has my lord and archangelist (*i.e.* arch-sender of messengers) Theodosius sent to offer to your all-holiness these *four* dishes of viands. And I know the innate and sincere devotion which he feels and fosters for you, O most blessed patriarchs, whom he promises to serve as long as he has life with all his heart and soul faithfully.'

The patriarchs were pleased with these addresses; and having given the boys their blessing, and gratified them with suitable presents, they dismissed them to return home.

CHAP. VI. *Visits of the Patriarchs to two holy monasteries.*

On the Sunday following the patriarchs went for worship to the new convent of the Ascension [in the Kremlin]; and having made a commemoration of the deceased [grand-princesses, tsaritsas, and other princesses] entombed there, they went in [from the church into the convent itself] and dined there, and having received a few presents left. In like manner on the next following Sunday they went to the Divichi convent to give their blessing to the nuns there; and after having partaken of a slight refection returned, the cold having suddenly become very severe. But in the intervening week they had been visited also by the most learned Simeon. He made an address to them in Latin, which was translated by the metropolitan of Gaza as follows:

'Welcome, most holy patriarchs! welcome, many-eyed shepherds! welcome, tender fathers and universal benefactors! welcome ten thousand times in the Lord! &c. &c., one soul in two bodies! the effect of whose coming is like sunrise on the birds, an! on all nature. So we, the young of the great eagle our Saviour, the nurselings of that most pure dove which descended on the head of the Lord in the Jordan, the chickens of that tender hen which so often would have spread her wings over the city of Jerusalem, &c. &c., rejoice now, like the Assyrians [in allusion to Antioch], who keep festival in April because

the sun then begins to ascend and to lengthen the days, and like the Egyptians of old, who had aforetime Serapis, but afterwards, by the good deed of the most blessed Theophilus, St. Michael for their patron, and who kept festival on the 6th of June, on account of the most beneficent rise of the golden Nile, measured upwards to sixteen cubits, &c. &c. Let David then now sing, "This is the day which the Lord hath made; we will rejoice and be glad in it;" a day with two suns; whereas in the first creation there was only a sun and a moon, &c. Ye are truly the eyes of the world, which direct our feet into the straight path of sincere piety and holiness, by which the Catholic Church, steered by your heavenly skill, passes over the waves of time well and prosperously, much better than the Argo which was piloted by the hard-tasked and anxious Jason. In the Apocalypse we read of two candlesticks, which offer a type of your patriarchates, lit with your inward love towards God and your neighbour, whereby ye are not hidden under the bushel, but set aloft to light all the house, &c. &c., sowing the good seed, going about in all directions, like new Triptolemi, like new Abarises, not boasting yourselves in arrows, but in the cross of Christ. Again, Zacharias the prophet saw two olive-trees, between which stood a candlestick fed with abundance of oil, symbolising you two great hierarchs, who dart the rays of orthodoxy on all, whether dwelling far or near, and pour the most abundant oil of wisdom and the radiance of holiness, portending that you are to be the channels to communicate abundant mercy and compassion to this land of Russia, which prays unceasingly that the oil of mercy may not fail from her vessels, and that when the bridegroom comes suddenly in the midst of that momentous night she may not be shut out, outside the door, &c. These and other like benefits we now receive, and trust to receive, through you; for which may God give you the just recompense in the day of judgment after you have lived here many years, Nestorian Olympiads, and the years of Methuselah, springing up ever fresh and flourishing, &c., to communicate . . . mercy and compassion to every neighbour in innumerable distributions and ungrudging beneficences. I have done.'

Chap. VII. *Certain preparatory matters (Prolegomena), or synodical questions.*

After these and other like welcomes, there was held a general

meeting in the new patriarchal palace [built by Nicon, and adjoining the tsar's palace in the Kremlin], which had been completed [or prepared for the synod? ἐξειργασμένῳ] in about two weeks, and well and handsomely adorned. And first of all a question was started whether it be lawful at all to hold synods at any time when there is need. For at first sight it may seem not to be lawful to assemble any number of local synods. For Gregory the Divine writes to Procopius (Ep. xlii.): 'I am myself inclined, if I must write the truth, to avoid every meeting of bishops, as I have never seen any good come of any one of them,' &c. [Of the rest of this chapter, twenty-two pages in length, we shall give only a summary]: of which Calvin makes great use to run down all synods and meetings of bishops; which is absurd. . . . . As if St. Gregory meant to vilify or slight the council of Nice, &c. which he so well knew had settled the faith. I must enter more at length into this question, with the reader's permission. Before the council of Nice there had been held forty-nine synods, as Agapius of Hierapolis attests, the apostles themselves having set the example, and having used these words, 'It seemeth good to the Holy Ghost and to us,' &c. [and he goes into details about each meeting at Jerusalem, with the date A.D. 34 for the Crucifixion. The lot which fell upon Matthias was not a literal lot (referring to Dion. Areop. *Eccl. Hier.* iii. and to George Pachymeres), as it is in the verse of Homer. The second synod he puts at A.D. 51 (Acts xv. and Galat. xii.), 'Then fourteen years afterwards,' &c. (as if from A.D. 34, first three years to A.D. 37, and fourteen more thence to A.D. 51), on the same subject on which he withstood St. Peter. All being silent, James, the first helmsman and bishop of Jerusalem, answered, 'My judgment is' (ἐγὼ κρίνω). Again, he says, there was a fourth synod in A.D. 58 (Acts xxi.) to tolerate the Jewish customs; to which St. Paul also conformed (according to the condescension of the seventeenth year from the resurrection in A.D. 51), and came up to Jerusalem at Pentecost with a vow, shorn, as being himself a Nazarene]. And as a delegation with the apostolic decree had been sent to Antioch (*i. e.* before), so now Paul appeared at Jerusalem, the metropolis of all Palestine and mother of all the Churches according to Theodoret (*Eccl. Hist.* lib. v.). Also, and first of all, there was the assembly on the day of Pentecost, when the Holy Ghost was given. Then

again the Twelve being met together composed the Creed in xii. articles before they separated and preached to the nations, as a symbol of the correct confession of all, and an invincible standard of that orthodoxy which should last for ever, &c.; as Augustine, Ambrose, Clement, and Leo attest, &c. Cyprian and Ruffinus affirm, Irenæus and Jerome Maximus and Epiphanius (*Hæres.* xii.) assent, and accredit the assertion, that the apostles had put forth also the sacred Mystagogia written afterwards by Clement, and the so-called Apostolical canons put together by the same Clement, and farther the much-contested Constitutions (that is, unadulterated, and uncorrupted by heretical hands). Lastly, they were once more assembled at Jerusalem at the time of the falling asleep (*κοίμησις, dormitio, assumptio*) of the all-holy Virgin, when they all came together from the ends of the earth to bury in the place of Gethsemane her most immaculate body, as, among others, Dion. Areop. in his book *De Nominibus Sacris*, chap. iii., addressing the blessed Hierotheus, says: 'When we also, as thou thyself knowest, and many of our holy brethren were come together to behold that body which was the fountain of life and the receptacle of the Deity; and there was there present also James the brother of God, and Peter the topmost and oldest summity of the divines,' &c. In like manner Juvenal, who adorned the throne of Jerusalem by his acquirements, and Nicephorus Callistus in the third book of his *Eccl. History*, and John Damascene, and Andrew of Jerusalem archbishop of Crete, in their compositions about the *κοίμησις*, write that in the 48th year of Christ she slept the life-giving sleep; so that all her life, if we add the fourteen or fifteen years before her divine conception, was sixty-two years or sixty-three, as Eusebius Pamphili says in his Chronicon, or, as Cedrenus will have it more exactly, only sixty-two. But to return to our point, which was to show the lawfulness of synods: Canon xxxvii. of the Apostles orders a synod to be held in each see or eparchy twice a year, in the fourth week of the pentecostal season, and on the twelfth day of Hyperboretæus or November. Again, can. xx. of Antioch, and can. vi. of the second council of Nice, relaxing the former decrees to once a year, and referring to a like relaxation in canon viii. of the Sixth council, 'when the metropolitan shall appoint,' &c. And the force of all these synods is derived from the authority and example of the apostles. Wherefore in

all ages there have been held particular or local and general or œcumenical synods for matters both of faith and discipline, and for moral and political constitutions, *not only* in times of Christian peace and rest, *but also under persecution* of tyrants. And the benefits obtained by them can scarcely be enumerated. They have been the horn of Amalthea, the μῶλυ of souls, and the νηπενθίς τ' ἄχολόν τε κακῶν ἐπίλησθον ἁπάντων. How else could Arius, Macedonius, Nestorius, Eutyches, the Origenists, the Monothelites, and the Iconoclasts, have been condemned and overthrown? So that Gregory Dialogus well said that he venerated the first four œcumenical synods as the four gospels. Wherefore also of old he who was full of spiritual ambrosia, Ambrose, cried aloud of the Nicene decree, 'Neither sword, nor fire, nor mighty man can separate me from that decree, any more than from Christ. The martyrs suffered all things for this alone. Yea, he who cannot lie has promised (Matt. xviii.), "Where two or three are met together in my name, there am I in the midst of them;" not as when (Luke xxiii.) being yet on earth he said, "I am in the midst of you as he that serveth," but as he sat teaching in the midst of the doctors.' Wherefore the bishops, the true successors of the twelve apostles, ofttimes went and met and held synods; and the archimandrites and hegoumens and presbyters, as followers and successors of the seventy-two apostles, subscribed the synodical decrees, after giving their opinions, with the holy scriptures set in the midst, &c. &c. Hence also it is said in the Acts (ch. v.): 'It has seemed good both to the Holy Ghost and to us.' And the Nicene synod spake defining thus: 'For the Catholic Church believes that she is teaching nothing fresh, but only presenting with more clear explanation the enigmas or mysteries of the holy scriptures,' &c. And for this reason, after the holding of the synods, there were those exclamations, &c. &c. And in the Fourth council they shouted repeatedly, 'Peter has spoken by the lips of Pope Leo.' A little water, the naturalists tell us, soon corrupts, but not a great body. . . . A great number of eyes, like the many-eyed Argus who had a hundred eyes like the coloured eyes of a peacock's tail, or like Lynceus who saw the secret recesses and mines, see more and see better than the single eye of the Gorgon, or the most solitary eye of the Cyclops Polyphemus [meaning Nicon]: for reasons are ever occurring to justify the proverb, that 'one is

as good as none for men of sense:' seeing that in the multitude for the most part is to be found both power, and wisdom, and intelligence, &c.: and Homer says that the vote of the majority is for the best. It is therefore possible that synods now also should be held in case of very apparent and pressing need; and the act of holding them is not irregular, nor inconsistent with the sacred rules.

CHAP. VIII. *Whether it was competent for our Autocrat Alexis to convoke a particular Synod.*

We have related above that our emperor Alexis sent letters to the four œcumenical patriarchs entreating them to come to Moscow, to review and finally judge the cause (*ἀναθεωρῆσαι κρίσιν*) of the ex-patriarch Nicon, who had ill administered the stewardship of the patriarchal power. This invitation, however, seemed to *some* to be uncanonical and unlawful, as if it belonged only to ecclesiastical persons, and *was by no means to be presumptuously undertaken by potentates. They* insisted that the power of judging (*κανονίζειν*) the Church, as Socrates says (*Eccl. Hist.* lib. ii.), has been given *to the bishop of Rome*, and consequently that every synod held without his consent is uncanonical. And hence the bishops presiding over the East are blamed by the Pope of that day, Julius, because without his consent they had held a synod at Antioch; whereas the old canons are distinct on this point, and say that in the case of every synod *the confirmation lies with the bishop of Rome:* and *the same was afterwards confirmed by the Novells of Justinian:* whence in novell cxxxi. it is declared that *no synod whatever is valid unless it be first confirmed by the apostolic see* of St. Peter. And in the case of Dioscorus, among the other accusations brought against him there was this, that he had presumed to convoke a synod without the apostolic will of Peter, which is considered to be unusual and indefensible. But in reply to these[7] and other like objections we shall adduce a multitude of testimonies. First we shall cite Socrates himself, who in the preface to his fifth book has these words: 'From the time that there began to be Christian rulers and emperors, the affairs of the Church depended on them (*ἤρτητο ἐξ αὐτῶν*), and even the

[7] Never really stated in this form, but purposely thus misrepresented by Paisius.

greatest synods have been held and are still held by their will.' And so Photius also, in his work respecting the seven councils, has affirmed, saying, 'In all which things the great Constantine, who deserved to be listened to, then wielding the sceptre of the Roman empire, was preëminently conspicuous, both convoking the synod, and heightening its solemnity by his presence.' And this may be shown inductively. First, Constantine, the phœnix of Christian emperors and kings, convoked the synod of Nice by encyclical letters sent to all parts; whence, among the rest, John also, the great archbishop of Persia, came at once to the holy assembly, and was numbered among the cccxviii. holy fathers. But to send for him to the synod the bishop of Rome, Sylvester, had no power whatever, inasmuch as Persia then was in no way under Sylvester, while Great Britain for instance was, inasmuch as he from the beginning was director and despot* only of the regions of the West (*διδύνοντι καὶ δεσπόζοντι*). And the rest of the distinguished representatives of the fathers were, farther, conveyed in chariots of the emperor to Nice, and all suitable expenses of their journey and maintenance were defrayed for them. In like manner also Theodosius the Great &c. assembled the Second council at C.P., and Marcian the Third at Ephesus, as every one who has the least knowledge of ecclesiastical history is aware, and as may be collected clearly from the letters themselves sent to Pope *Dam*asus (that *adam*ant of the faith), wherein it is expressly added that he was by the imperial authority called to the assembly. Note, too, that Leo of Rome, that great glory of the Church, who besought the emperor Theodosius the younger that a council might be held within the borders of Italy, was not listened to; but when it was held, it was held only in the splendid city of Ephesus. And again, when the same Leo had asked through the synod from the emperor Marcian for some delay, he did not obtain his request, though he was so great and so distinguished a father, but was obliged to submit to the emperor's command. And when the emperor Valentinian happened to be staying at Rome, the bishop of Rome with the bishops about him besought him even with bended knees that he would be pleased to intercede with the emperor Theodosius, that there should be held yet another synod. So it is not by the bishop of Rome, but by the

* *δεσπότης*, a title now given to all bishops, even in the Greek liturgy.

Roman emperors, that the œcumenical and canonical synods are convoked and proclaimed. And consequently it was competent for our most potent emperor Alexis also, as being equal in rank to the ancient emperors (as Justinian the Great who called the Fifth council against the Origenists; Constantine Pogonatus, grandson of Heraclius, who called the Sixth against the Monothelites; and Constantine who with his mother Irene, wearing the crown of orthodoxy, assembled the Seventh council against the Iconoclasts), both to assemble a synod, and by letters *of request* to send for and to beg to come to him the four patriarchs presiding over the Eastern Church, in order to review the judgment of Nicon, and investigate certain other ecclesiastical matters, for the edification of the whole body of the Church. But come now, come, let us work this exposition with more detail. For the discussion of this problem on which we are engaged is no small matter for those who have exercised themselves in the whole πένταθλον of ecclesiastical history. And first, it is *admitted* that the emperors *by no means convoke the synods by compulsory command*, but certainly only by request (δεητικῶς), and with all friendliness and graciousness, for the sake of the general peace and good order of the world, address their invitations to the bishops; as may be seen in the third imperial letter of the emperors Valentinian and Marcian, which has these words: 'For we of our ardent zeal for the faith have at the present time set aside the pressing exigencies of public affairs, making it our first object that the orthodox and true faith may in the presence of our serenity be confirmed.' In the same way also Constantine, the faithful emperor, in the sacred (*i.e.* imperial) letter sent to Pope Agatho, writes word for word thus: 'For we are competent to suggest and to invite, with a view to the general welfare and union of all Christians; *but to compel we by no means desire.* We bid therefore by all means your fatherly beatitude not to hinder the will of God.' For this reason the emperors in the œcumenical synods *presided;* as Theodosius the Great in that of C.P., as Sozomen, for one (lib. vii.), attests. Nevertheless, in act i. of the council of Chalcedon we read the following words: 'Since then the most religious emperor (viz. Marcian) has been habituated by the tradition of his grandfather to confirm the orthodox faith, and not to suffer the canons to be at all infringed, we think it well that the matter be referred to

him; and if he orders a suit or trial to be instituted and carried through, so that the parties be heard by their representatives pleading for them, this also is accepted by us. For it is just that what is decreed by the most religious emperor should be carried into execution, in imitation and emulation of his predecessor the most holy emperor Constantine.' For Theodoret writes in book i. of his *Eccl. Hist.*: 'And there entered the emperor himself also with a few attendants, last of all, being in person of imposing stature, and in the prime of age and comeliness, and still more remarkable for the expression of modesty which was on his brow. And a plain seat having been set in the midst, he sat down on it, after first asking permission of the bishops; and at the same time with him all that assembly seated themselves.' Theodosius (which was more than this) in the council of Ephesus presided even by his deputy, the consul Candidatus. And Marcian was present in the council of Chalcedon personally, and directed the judges who were there, like another Zorobabel. Moreover, the first emperors confirmed the synods, subscribing their acts in red letters. Thus in the Sixth council the emperor subscribed first in vermilion thus: 'I, Flavius Constantinus, being a faithful believer in Jesus Christ who is God, emperor of the Romans, agreeing with all that has been determined, have subscribed.' And though in the synod held against Photius the emperors Basil, Constantine, and Leo are found to have subscribed after the subscriptions of the legates of the Pope and the commissioners of the patriarchs, still in the synaxaria for the Sunday of the commemoration of the Nicene fathers, we read that the great and apostle-like Constantine confirmed the holy creed by subscribing it last of all with red letters. And the Chronographer writes in his synopsis, that the synodical volume of the Seventh œcumenical council was subscribed with their own hands by the emperor Constantine and his mother Irene, and also by Tarasius the patriarch, and by the commissioners of Pope Hadrian, and by those of the other patriarchs. Also the fathers of the council of C.P., in their address to the emperor Theodosius, add the following words: 'We pray, then, that by a letter of thy serenity the vote of the synod may be confirmed; that as thou hast honoured the Church by thy letters calling us together, so also thou mayest confirm the result of our decisions.' And in the address of the Sixth synod to the emperor Constantine we read:

'But, O sovereign, lover of goodness and justice, make this return to Him who has bestowed on thee the power, and as a seal to our decisions give them your written imperial confirmation, so that no man may either speak against what has been done or devise any other question. For know, O most serene emperor, that of all that has been decreed before by the synods and by the eminent fathers we have infringed on nothing, but rather have reconfirmed all.' And besides this, after the address, the holy synod said verbally: 'We ask the religious and divinely-crowned dominion of the sovereign that by thy divine subscription authority be given to the constitution which we have framed and signed.' Constantine, the most religious emperor, said in reply: 'What the holy and œcumenical synod asks we will at once do:' and thereupon he took the constitution of the holy synod already signed by the bishops, and with his own hand subscribed it. Lastly, and chiefly, let us put as a conclusion to this question a passage of Sylvester Syropulus the great ecclesiarch and dikaiophylax. For he, in his *History of the Council of Florence*, gives us the following narrative, more precious than gold or ivory: 'Our people then,' he says, 'were considering how they should draw up the constitution. The emperor then and those of our side said that the name of the emperor should be put first, according to the order and the constitutions of the œcumenical synods, and then that of the Pope. But the Latins would not so much as hear this spoken of. For they said that the papal dignity vastly exceeded the imperial; and how then should the Pope be put after the emperor? But those of our side said that it is the privilege of the emperor to assemble the synod, and for this reason his name is put first, as is manifest from the acts. The Latins said that the present synod was assembled by the Pope, since it was by his determination, and at his expense; and that in this respect he was their leader, and had precedence of them, and they should rather write in the constitution that the Pope had both convoked the synod, and that through him the union had been made. To this the emperor objected that, though it were true that the Pope had defrayed the charges, still, unless our messengers and edicts had been sent, neither would the patriarchs of the Eastern Church have named commissioners, nor would any of the bishops presiding in our Church or of the races belonging to it have come, or sent any one to the synod, for any

wish or edict of the Pope. So that on this ground also it is I that have assembled the synod, and I ought to be put first. But besides these reasons, it is enough that in all the œcumenical synods the names of the emperors come first; and this, as being also œcumenical, ought therefore to follow their precedents.' After all the constitution was written thus: 'Eugenius bishop, servant of the servants of God, with the concurrence of our most well-beloved John Palæologus the most illustrious emperor of the Romans, of the commissioners of our venerable brethren the patriarchs, and the other representatives of the Eastern Church,' &c. Whence it is plain that there can be no question but this present synod at Moscow was fairly and legitimately convoked by our most potent and divinely-chosen emperor Kyr Kyr Alexis Michaelovich, who both issued the letters, and defrayed the charges, and incurred all manner of expenses, more than can be imagined, for the preparation, the convocation, and the holding of this synod, as no one can fail to know of all those who have any place in this imperial court. And this, as we proceed, our narrative will show and bring before the reader still more distinctly. Let no one, then, wonder if it should happen that oft-times hereafter and in divers places here and there in this noble history *we should touch and dilate on the emperor's praises. For the monarch Alexis himself*, who, according to Ezekiel, is the prince of the Ross, *is both the beginning and the middle and the end of this splendid theme*, of which we have set up the golden pillars (ὑπεστήσαμεν), to use the words of Pindar, who sings: 'Wherefore, as in duty bound, we vindicate him, and ten thousand times celebrate him, returning again and again to the theme.' And I will add the words of Musæus, 'Neither will I forget nor be ever unmindful' [of him].

CHAP. IX. *What, then, is this present assembly? an œcumenical Synod, or a particular trial and judgment (κρίσις)?*

This question also, among others, was synodically considered, what such a meeting as this is to be called? a synod, or simply a trial and judgment? and for the resolution of this question there were immediately adduced the remarks of Silvester Syropulus, who has raised the same question concerning the council of Florence. And in one way, he says, it may be called an œcumenical council, since the emperor John (the seventh of the

Palæologi, who reigned in C.P. 194 years and 10 months) was present at it, with Eugenius the Pope of old Rome and Joseph patriarch of new Rome; and the representatives of the other patriarchs, Philotheus of Alexandria, Dionysius of Antioch, and Joachim of Jerusalem; and other bishops more than can here be enumerated on both sides sat in it, so as to exhibit the show and form of an œcumenical synod. Discussions were conducted in it in order, as in the other holy œcumenical synods; and what was said in them was written down at great length. Nevertheless he concludes that it can by no means be called an œcumenical synod, because there was no synodical decision made in it, nor judgment and constitution contained in any definition, but merely a pact and agreement of the two parties, that they should both retain their own judgment and ancestral opinion which they the Romans [the Greeks, that is] and the Latins had held respectively, without having come to any conclusion: only that they should all unite together and agree to be content that either Church should hold its own, the meetings [for making this agreement] having been held with much secrecy, and the proofs having been worked up in the dark privately by certain persons, and in private apartments in the Pope's palace. Therefore, since in the present assembly at Moscow there will be present the renowned and divinely-honoured emperor Kyr Kyr Alexis Michaelovich, and the two most blessed and most holy patriarchs Kyr Paisius of Alexandria and Kyr Macarius of Antioch (as there were only two present at Nice, Alexander of Alexandria and Eustathius of Antioch), and all the local bishops, and many other distinguished bishops from other countries collected from various parts from the patriarchates of the Eastern Churches, it might justly be concluded that this assembly had *in a manner* the form and appearance of an œcumenical synod. Nevertheless, it cannot *properly* be called an œcumenical synod, because there is no dogma of faith to be proposed for consideration in it, or made the subject of a definition; nor is any dogmatical decree sought or made in it, but only a simple trial and judgment of Nicon, or rather a certain exact conviction [and condemnation] of the particular acts done by him. Therefore it cannot be called an œcumenical council, but only a particular trial and judicial decision, having for its end the most absolute deposition of Nicon. Nor let any one urge against me that the

council held in time past against the patriarch Photius, when he was deposed, is by some entitled œcumenical, in which council were present the representatives of Pope Nicholas of Rome, and of Michael patriarch of Antioch, and Theophilus of Jerusalem, and very many other distinguished bishops, with the most blessed patriarch Ignatius himself; seeing that this synod, though very similar to ours at Moscow, is not called the Eighth (for that held at Florence is the only one which has claimed this title); and besides that reason which I have treated of above, viz. that it made no theological definition on the subject of the Holy Ghost, but merely a judicial condemnation and decision, it is not accepted but rejected to this day by the Orientals, *almost* without exception.[9] So this which is now to meet will not be an œcumenical synod, but only a particular assembly of bishops, and a definitive judgment against the lawless Nicon, who has been lawfully deposed from the patriarchal chair *by the patriarchal consultations* [of A.D. 1661], and by the episcopal vote of the synod [of A.D. 1660] which passed its judgment without any partiality, *through the ministerial assistance* of our great and divinely-guided emperor Kyr Kyr Alexis Michaelovich, as our narrative as it proceeds will most clearly show. *This having been said by way of preparation*, and all thereupon being silent, Paisius the metropolitan of Gaza arose, and made, for the sake of stating clearly the necessary distinctions, the following most rhetorical speech [which we abridge]:

'Pharaoh's seven lean kine and seven blasted ears of corn, which were seven years of famine, devoured the fat ones. The seven good ones were the seven ages which produced good men adorned with all virtues, men learned in all sciences, cultivators of Christ's vineyard, who multiplied the seed of piety a hundredfold, gathering the wheat into garners, and plucking up with it the tares to burn. So it was not the lean kine and ears that ate up the full ones, but the contrary. The preceding times were the lean, in which there was as yet no [œcumenical] synod. Again, Joshua bade the seven priests hold the seven trumpets, and so they did six days; and on the seventh day they compassed Jericho seven times, &c. The seven trumpets are the seven œcumenical synods, which bring down the lofty walls of the heresies. Yet the tongues of the god-defying giants were confounded,

[9] *i.e.* by all except the Uniats, with whom he was not unconnected himself.

and the malignant Telchins and Titans were dispersed; and their tower, as built of clay, fell to the ground, and became dust, and was carried away into the air as chaff, and was altogether destroyed to its foundations, so that their memorial perished as a voice dies away upon the ear. What do I mean by all these images, but that the Lord has willed that the synods which really are and are reputed to be œcumenical should be seven, and seven only, according to the figure which we have in the seven Catholic epistles; the two of Peter figuring the two councils of Nice, that of James the council of Ephesus, the three of John the three councils of C.P., and the one of Jude the council of Chalcedon. But why do I delay to adduce also the seven days of creation, as most clearly figuring the seven synods of the universe; the first day clearly signifying the council of Nice, in which shone forth the timeless light of the Divine Word, and Arius the workman of night was darkened like a *νυκτικόραξ*? [and so on, paralleling the rest]. The seventh day, the Sabbath, the seal of creation, the sign of rest, typifies clearly the seventh œcumenical council, when the holy icons were restored, and the scandals of the Church brought to an end. And as respects the sabbatical river, Josephus and Pliny write that it lay dry all the six days of the week, and flowed abundantly on the Sabbath alone, though in the time of Vespasian it stopped and dried up altogether, which was a sign, not to be mistaken, that all the snortings of the impious were then shown to be folly and withered; the seven synods having all but written, as an inscription on a monument, on columns or stelæ, a prohibition saying, "Go no farther;" as Justinian's equestrian statue on a column, with his hand extended to the east, forbade the Persians to cross into territory not their own, so [bidding the Church] to stand only on her existing positions and canons, and not to go forward so as to stray from them one way or another; for they will not get much profit from any such marauding inroad. Hence we conclude for the indubitable and veritable number of the Seven œcumenical councils, that it goes no farther, nor admits of addition, but ends with the seven-zoned apocatastasis of the Sabbath. Let there not then be, or be named, any œcumenical synod beyond the seven, but only sacred congresses, meetings, assemblies, and conferences. Wherefore also that assembly which met in the church of St. Sophia was called the First and Second

(ἡ πρώτη καὶ δευτέρα), and not the Eighth or Ninth synod. I have done.' And all were satisfied with what he had said. And so the said conference of the bishops broke up.

CHAP. X. *How two great questions were proposed to the Patriarchs for solution.*

Two other questions were proposed to be resolved by the patriarchs in their apartments.[10] . . . The first was this: Whence is it that the patriarch of Alexandria is styled 'œcumenical judge and thirteenth apostle,' and that he wears a gold fillet (λῶρον) round his head? And the second: When did the patriarch of Antioch first begin to be called 'shepherd of shepherds, bishop of bishops, and father of fathers,' and to have the title of 'thirteenth apostle'? For though Theodore Balsamon (and his predecessor Peter) says in his letter to Dominic of Venice that the title of patriarch belongs properly and exclusively to the [patriarch] of Antioch, he has neither shown clearly the fact, nor its cause. As touching the first question, there was adduced the story of Theophanes and the logothete Epiphanius, of the difference between the emperor Basil the younger and John patriarch of C.P., and the judgment of Theophilus patriarch of Alexandria, who, having made two wax figures, cut out the tongue of the one and cut off the hand of the other. This he did in the church of St. Sophia; and for this he was crowned by the hand of the emperor with a gold tiara, and the patriarch gave him his own epitrachelion or stole (since which time he wears two), and the titles of 'œcumenical judge,' &c. And I think it was this same Theophilus who was thenceforth also called 'thirteenth apostle,' as a master of science and wise architect, another Bezaleel, for his opportune thought of making the two images. A different and a simpler explanation is given by the patriarch Meletius, who in his epistle to the Russians says, that there being an excessive jealousy between old and new Rome, and [the bishop of] the old Rome striving not only for precedence but dominion, and enslaving all the Church, this sight ought to have deterred the rest from such rivalry: but when the

[10] This also is abridged, being mere trifling, like what has preceded, and only amplified, or forged, to amuse the reader, and to draw his mind away from those facts and proceedings which ought to have been related, but are not.

third primate, viz. the patriarch of Alexandria, had pronounced a just judgment against the two contending rivals of old and new Rome, he on this specious pretext took to himself the title of 'œcumenical judge.' Others, however, add, I know not whence, that the patriarch of Alexandria once judged a certain Italian king (*ῥῆγα*) who had a contest with the Pope, and so received from him the tiara, and from the Pope the title of Pope, and the second epitrachelion. The truth is that Meletius Pega here writes obscurely, and it is hard to say what he means. But I think he is alluding to that title of 'œcumenical,' about which Gregory Dialogus contended much with John the Faster. For Gregory, as an excellent spiritual physician, knowing well that contrary remedies tell commonly against contrary diseases, first began to style himself 'Gregory, bishop, servant of the servants of God,' as may be seen in his letter to the emperor Maurice and to the empress. In like manner as it is related of the apostle-like emperor Constantine by Nicephorus Blemmides that, whereas the emperors his predecessors had been used to write 'My dominion orders and defines thus,' he changed this, and substituted 'My sovereignty determines.' So we find also in the acts of the Sixth council that the emperor Constantine said: whereas Mahomet, after taking Constantinople, wrote on the *πρόζυρα* four times the letter B, thus, B. B. B. B., for *βασιλεὺς βασιλέων βασιλεῦσι βασιλεύων* (king of kings, kinging it over kings). Such pompous titles then, Meletius concludes, should be cast out of the Church of Christ, though he nevertheless tolerated and used them courteously, only giving something like a rebuke to those who awkwardly and ignorantly give to the patriarchal titles an improper sense.

But as to the reason why the patriarch of Alexandria wears a mitre like that of the Pope of Rome even in the assemblies of the Church, Simeon of Thessalonica, in his reply to the Questions of Kyr Gabriel metropolitan of Pentapolis, says that this was borrowed from the high-priests of the old law, since they also wore a *κίδαρις*, which they called a mitre, and a tiara (it is called *κυρβασία* by Chrysostom). Some, however, say that this was given by the first Christian emperor Constantine to Sylvester: and in the Chrysobulla, which both the Latins adduce and which Matthew Blastar inserts in his Nomocanon, ascribing it to Constantine the Great, *this* is written: that Constantine

gave the stemma of the empire, set with jewels, to Sylvester, as to his spiritual father, by way of honouring the priesthood; and when Sylvester, out of humility, would not receive the golden crown and the diadem, he forced him to accept the gilt λῶρον (laurel?) which was on the emperor's head, which is a type of Christ's resurrection: and this with his own hands he put on the head of Sylvester. But they say that Cyril the Great of Alexandria received from Pope Celestine the privilege of wearing the mitre, and what is called the sacrum with the gold λῶρον, when he was his representative in the Third council, as Theodore Balsamon relates at length, &c.; and thence his successors have perpetuated the same in memory of that event. And while all other bishops celebrate the liturgy uncovered, the patriarch of Alexandria alone celebrates with the same sacred λῶρον, which is also called the sacrum, and the gold tiara on his head. I know that it is said that this covering of the head was devised by St. Cyril on account of some headaches, or other infirmity in the head, to which he was subject, and that afterwards, having received from above, by the divine inspiration of the all-pure Mother of God, a bit of stuff from a phenolion of St. John Chrysostom, and having put it like the λῶρον about his head, he was immediately healed of his pains. For Cyril had such an enmity against Chrysostom, and inveighed so passionately against him, that he exclaimed in the time of his enmity, 'If John is to be reckoned as a patriarch, Judas is an apostle!' as was the case with Epiphanius also, who tried to show that John was an Origenist. So then, when he was president at Ephesus, he asked leave to wear on his head this covering for his infirmity, and was allowed by the fathers to do so. But if that epistle is genuine which Theodosius patriarch of Jerusalem is said to have written to Ignatius of C.P., and he really wrote thus, 'We have sent to thee the ποδήρης and the ἐπωμὶς, with the mitre, the sacerdotal attire of James the brother of God,' &c., it follows that James was the first who wore a mitre, as the legal high-priest had been used to wear the κίδαρις, which also, as Simeon of Thessalonica says, was called a mitre. And before him Epiphanius of Cyprus (in *Hæres. Nazaræorum*) says: 'This James was the son of Joseph by his first wife, and was a Nazarite, and sanctified to the Lord as the first-born son of Joseph.' We have found it asserted also that he was a priest according to

the old law, and on that account was allowed once in the year to enter into the Holy of Holies, as it was commanded by the law that the high-priests should do. It was also allowed him to wear on his head τὸ πέταλον (*i.e.* the leaf or fillet), as men worthy of credence have distinctly attested in their writings, especially Eusebius Pamphili (lib. ix. cap. xxiii.), who introduces also St. Polycrates as saying that St. John the Evangelist was a priest, and had been used to wear the gold πέταλον on his head.

For the question why the patriarch of Alexandria is styled 'thirteenth apostle,' the explanation given was this, that it was because the evangelist St. Mark had been one of the Seventy apostles, and from him, as having been the first hierarch there, this title descended to his successors the bishops of Alexandria. But this answer will not suit the case of the other patriarch to whom the same title is given. For we find in a certain old Ordinal (τακτικὸν) that the bishop of C.P. also is styled thirteenth apostle. And yet Andrew, the first-called disciple, who was a πέτρος (*i.e.* a 'living stone') before Peter, is one of the Twelve, not one of the Seventy. If then Athanasius in Ode IV. of the Matins for his day is called by the hymnographer Theophanes a 'thirteenth apostle,' this is not so much because he was successor of St. Mark the Evangelist, as on account of his eminence and power as a teacher: just as Chrysostom too is called a thirteenth apostle, not because he was successor of the apostle St. Andrew, but because he was a great light and teacher of all the world. This appears more clearly if we adduce the words of the troparia (the verses of the hymns) alluded to, &c., and those of the prayer Ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν, ὁ τῇ σῇ οἰκονομίᾳ, κ.τ.λ. in the form for the consecration of bishops, &c. Since then, among the apostles, the herald of the Gentiles, Paul, is, and is called, a thirteenth apostle, so in like manner every patriarch, on account of the ministry of teaching belonging to the patriarchal power, may be called encomiastically a thirteenth apostle, in a word an imitator, follower, and successor of St. Paul. St. John Chrysostom, for his earnest homily on the festival of the Lights (τὰ φῶτα, the Theophany), was honoured by the emperor Theodosius, who was among his hearers, with the imperial sakkos, for greater encouragement and solemnity, and also that he might have his arms freer for rhe-

torical gesticulation. Whence also Theodore Balsamon adds that the patriarchal lantern and seal, with the τρικήριον and δικήριον (the triple and double lights), and the mandya with πόμματα and ποταμοὶ (stripes like rivers) on it, are emblematic of the office and dignity of teaching.

It would be superfluous farther to multiply testimonies; yet we will bring two or three old witnesses, that so every word may be established. First, Gregory of Nyssa, who in his funeral sermon for his brother Basil parallels him with 'the thirteenth apostle Paul,' so that he may be called a thirteenth apostle for his preaching only of the gospel. And the same Basil himself writes of St. Ambrose, that 'the Holy Ghost translated him [from his civil eminence] to the presidency of the apostles; for grace is ever producing fresh grace; since the grace of the all-holy Spirit is not to come to an end.' In conclusion, St. Cyril says in his commentary on St. John, 'The apostles entered into the labours of the prophets, and in like manner the successors of the apostles fill up what is lacking to the apostles,' &c. &c. Some one will say to us, perhaps, that thus the chair of Mark is wronged, as to it belongs exclusively the title of 'thirteenth apostle.' In truth the chair of Mark has a special right to this title for its having founded so many Churches of the Gentiles; even as Attica for its colonies was called mother, and the isle of Chios, for example, daughter; as Sion is called the mother of the Churches by John Damascene; and Alexandria, as the mother of many Churches, went even as far as Gades, to the ends of the earth; and for this the successors of St. Mark may be magnified with the title of thirteenth apostle. And Athanasius, who superintended not so much Alexandria as the world, . . . ordained and sent Frumentius to be archbishop of India; and Protesius again, who was ordained in the room of the unhappy Dioscorus, and who was pierced to death with reeds by the Monothelites, ordained and sent Gregentius to the city of Kephro, where there was a great multitude of Jews, with Ervan their chief rabbi, who was blind both in body and in soul. And he, being converted, was baptised by the name of Leo, and regained his sight, and became one of the synclete of the prince, and was followed by the rest; of whom 5000 were baptised in one day, and all the rest after them. To the chair of Mark also it was that Ethiopia stretched out her hands for help; and through it all the king-

dom of the Homeritæ was baptised, and, in a word, all Arabia Felix, which, after becoming Christian, attached itself dutifully to the chair of Alexandria. Now it is commonly said that he who founds and establishes a Church is accounted an apostle, wherefore also the thrice-great Constantine is with propriety called apostle-like (ἰσαπόστολος) because in his golden consulship Christianity was extended. Alexandria, then, has a just and special claim to this great title of thirteenth apostle, &c. as having produced of old such great lights, and as producing still even in our own times learned patriarchs, as Meletius, Cyril, and Metrophanes, distinguished for wisdom and eloquence. Let those then rave on and go, with bad luck to them, to the ravens, who say (and among them Nicon is one) that the patriarchs no longer enjoy the divine power, because they have been expelled forsooth from their patriarchal thrones, which had been originally allotted them, through the incursions and impious violence of the unbelieving Gentiles. For though the patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch have been expelled, says Theodore Balsamon, from their glory, still from their thrones themselves they have by no means separated their residences; but the one of them has his chair in Egypt, the other in Damascus: *for where the patriarch is, there also is the patriarchal and apostolic chair.* Wherefore also it is a trite saying, that *where the Pope is, there is Rome,* alluding to the time when the Roman Pontiff resided in France. . . . If I were not afraid of being tedious, I would relate how when Pope Alexander of Alexandria had convoked a synod for the destruction of pagan idols, all the idols at their united prayer fell down and were reduced to dust, except one; and that one too, on the approach of St. Spiridion of Trimythos; and how Theophilus cast down from his great column Serapis the great god of the Egyptians, and put St. Michael in his place. But I forbear. . . .

As for Antioch, Balsamon says that the patriarch of Antioch is styled specially 'father of all the fatherhoods or patriæ' (πατὴρ τῶν πατριῶν ἁπασῶν), that is 'patriarch' (πατριάρχης), since the time when Euodius was ordained by Peter; and there the name of Christians was first given. And there Kissar, the eldest son of the governor, was by Peter and Paul raised from the dead, after he had been dead fifteen years. (The apostles, as they appeared to Kissar below, were two venerable and white-haired elders.)

So all the family and Kissar himself, and 5000 of the people, were baptised the same day. Paul with his foot produced a fountain to baptise Kissar; and the tomb of Kissar was enlarged into a church and a patriarchal residence. So Paul uses the word *πατριὰ*, and we sing *Δεῦτε, πατριαὶ, κ.τ.λ.* The rest are called either 'archbishops,' as those of C.P. and Jerusalem, or 'popes,' as those of Rome and Alexandria. The bishop of Antioch alone was called *πατριῶν πατὴρ* or 'patriarch,' as being the prime source of the fathers, and putter-forth of the shepherds (*ἀρχὴ τῶν πατέρων καὶ προβολεὺς τῶν ποιμένων*), because he was successor of the protothronus St. Peter, not by the passion of encroachment. Nevertheless the Church of Antioch, says Theodore Balsamon, learning that the others were called patriarchs for the sake of the identity of the honour, and because the five patriarchs hold the place and representation of the one Head of the body of the holy Churches of God, [acquiesced in this custom]. And Dionys. Areop. (lib. iv. *Eccl. Hier.*) says that 'the Most Holy sanctifies himself for us, and fills us with all sanctification.' Is Christ then insulted when he hears his own chief apostle called Most Holy? for so Nathaniel in his 'Protheórema to the divine Liturgy' (cap. xl.) called Peter, who is made a rock by the faith, and even all the tetrad of the most blessed patriarchs, which takes the same title. So Peter is called stone (*λίθος*), and rock (*πέτρα*), and foundation of the faith, though according to Hosea Christ is the stone; and according to Dionysius the chief corner-stone, &c.; and the rock too, according to St. Paul, who says, 'and that rock was Christ,' who is by nature the rock itself, the stone itself, the foundation itself. 'For other foundation can no man lay,' &c.; according to the same apostle. But to return to this city of Antioch, the eye of Syria. The Jews of old, carried away captive by the Babylonians, sat by the river Euphrates, and wept sore; but their weeping was turned to joyful laughter in the metropolis of Syria, in Antioch, near Daphnæ, when Peter, the prince of the disciples, came there to found the apostolic chair, as indeed he did, fixing it holily and happily; which chair, made of palm-wood, and afterwards sheathed with silver by the Christian emperors of the Romans, remained safe and undamaged to the time of Theodore Balsamon. . . . It was not fitting that this apostolic chair of Peter should be set up in Jerusalem, lest any one should think that it was honoured not for its own sake, but for the sake of the

Lord's sepulchre. Therefore this apostle, going forth as the sun from Jerusalem to enlighten the east and the west, came to Cesarea Philippi, and there ordained Zaccheus the publican, and at Berytus he ordained Quartus, and at Byblus John Mark, and at Tripoli Maron; and Luke, one of the seventy, he ordained when he had crossed to Laodicea; and so at last he came to Antioch, where he ordained Euodius, of sweet *od*our, declaring him the primate; and thence departing after seven years,[11] or according to others after twelve years,[12] he went by divine revelation to the elder Rome, the capital of the Romans, that he, Simon Peter, might there engage in single combat with Simon Magus, who also had a statue set up to him on the bank of the Tiber with an inscription, 'To Simon the great god,' as Justin the martyr and philosopher relates. And so, after having lived in Rome many years, and having appointed Linus the first bishop, he departed, not without divine inspiration, to Alexandria, to set up the great throne there also, and that of the thirteenth apostle. For when he had come thither, he ordained Mark the Evangelist, his own true disciple, to be its ruler; and thence, having gone over the regions around [the Mediterranean], he arrived in Spain [Iberia?], where also he suffered violence, having the hair shaven from his head, which is the origin of the παπαλήθρα [the clerical tonsure, so called by the Greeks] and the sign of the crown of thorns: and afterwards he continued preaching courageously to the same nations, as the patriarch Germanus, and after him the priest John, and Nathaniel relates (in cap. i. entitled 'Of the sense of the tonsure of the priest's head,' that is of the papalithra). And so, after a long and laborious time, he returned the second time to Rome, to shed his blood. And though as a man he feared, and was minded to escape from the struggles of martyrdom, and would have escaped, had not Christ appeared to him as if going somewhither in haste, and to his question, 'Domine, quo vadis?' replied, 'Romam vado, iterum crucifigi;' at which words he returned to Rome, strengthened with power from on high: and having been crucified with his head downwards, as he himself had asked, he signified that for the time to come his chair should

[11] A.D. 35+7=42.

[12] *i.e.* from the crucifixion in A.D. 30, instead of seven from the persecution and dispersion of Stephen in A.D. 35, and indicating the same date for leaving Palestine, viz. A.D. 42.

be the head. And thence originate the boasts of Rome, like the rushings of a river which make glad the city of Sion, because its bishop is the successor of Peter the prince of the apostles. Thence Simeon of Thessalonica exclaims, 'Let Sylvester have all his privileges, and all the successors of Peter for time to come (as Linus, Anacletus, and Clemens, whom Peter ordained and appointed to be successively suffragans, as is witnessed by Irenæus, Epiphanius, Eusebius, and Tertullian, not as chorepiscopi, but as true successors): only let the Pope stand in the petrified faith of Peter, [and then] let him be counted both the apex of all, and the first and supreme bishop: and let him glorify himself to the utmost with the honour of Sylvester, since the Fourth council also, of the DCXXX. fathers, entitled the letter of Leo, Pope of Rome, the pillar of orthodoxy and the end of all lengthy disputation, as it agreed entirely with the confession of the thrice-great and supreme prince of the apostles, Peter. And the select fathers at Chalcedon received joyfully the expressions of Pope Leo as they were read, as loud utterances of Peter personally present: and the divinely-assembled choirs of the Sixth and Seventh councils styled the chair of Rome 'the apostolic chair.' And Domitius the bishop of Prusias is to be mentioned, who speaks thus: 'I follow the relations which have been sent from our father Agatho, the archbishop of the apostolic and supreme chair of the elder Rome, to our divinely-crowned and most serene lord and great victorious emperor: I receive them as inspired by the Holy Ghost and by Peter the prince of the apostles, and as written by him with the finger of the aforesaid thrice-blessed Pope Agatho; and I embrace them with an inseparable accord.'

As then having the first chair [in order of time], and being apostolic before any other, the bishop of Antioch claims specially to himself those great titles of 'father of fathers, shepherd of shepherds, and bishop of bishops,' with which same titles the apostolic throne of Mark also is adorned. For Theodore Balsamon, in his reply to the Questions of the most holy patriarch Mark of Alexandria, gives him these titles, &c. The same titles of exceeding honour Basil of Achrida had given before to Hadrian Pope of Rome, writing thus: 'And as a shepherd of shepherds, according to thy pastoral and heaven-taught wisdom, thou teachest us not to be neglectful, but to care for the flock.' From one and the same Peter then it is, the most blessed and the

most supreme prince of the apostles, that such magnificent titles originate, and bursting up, as springs, run in streams here and there, expanding and dividing. For what is good is apt to communicate itself; and affectionate children and true disciples are sometimes honoured with the privileges of their parents and teachers. And the first chair of Antioch, at Daphnæ, is adorned with titles on account of the colonies which it sent out to different provinces. For example, in the time of Justinian, when Bachtan was king in Iberia, to those wild and dark regions it sent Amban, Abib, Stephen, Arsenius, David, John, Antony, Joseph, Hesychius, Judas, Jesse, and Thomas, as before Hermon patriarch of Jerusalem had sent six bishops to the Chersonese, viz. Capito, Ephraimites, Basil, Agathodorus, Elpidius, and Etherius. And now I know why St. John Chrysostom is not only called 'like an apostle' (ἰσαπόστολος), but also a 'thirteenth apostle,' as like St. Paul having a great mouth, and great understanding. For he, yes he, that bright star of the East, overthrew from their foundations the idol temples of Phœnicia, of Gaza, and of Ascalon, &c., and enlightened the Scythians of Thrace and other barbarians. So too he sent into the East, where the Marcionites were numerous, apostolic and learned men, and put to shame all error. And afterwards *Ignatius*, who, having his soul kindled with the fire of the Spirit, brought the Russians to the knowledge of God, sending the bishop *Alexis* to *Vladimir* the grand prince; who like the phœnix and the asbestus remained unburned in the midst of the flames, holding the gospel of Christ in his hands as an ἐγκόλπιον (as an amulet), a miracle which Tsigaras of Jannina, in his *Synopsis of Divers Histories*, relates at length. But to conclude all: let Meletius the most distinguished patriarch of Alexandria be heard. For he, in the synodical session and act held in the church of the all-holy and ever-virgin Mary, called Our Lady of Consolation (παραμυθίας), for the elevation of the metropolitan see of Moscow to the highest rank of the patriarchate, in the reign of Theodore Ivanovich autocrat of Moscow and all Russia, among many other words spoke also the following: 'In truth the criterion of our love to our Saviour and God is pastoral diligence. For he says to Peter, "Lovest thou me? Feed my sheep: Feed my lambs." . . . . And now by the grace of God the Church of Christ remains organised, having received its perfect settlement in the seven œcumenical councils.

. . . . Since then the establishment of the patriarchal thrones also had ever in deed [even from the first] been sketched by anticipation in outline, and this was embodied later and more distinctly in the First council (canon vi.), speaking thus, "Let the ancient customs remain in force," &c.; and the Seventh council says, "The throne of Elia &c. shall be the fifth and last, the other patriarchal thrones being preferred in honour;" that no idea,' he says, 'might be fostered as if the kingdom of Christ were earthly; and in the Fourth council, can. xxviii.: "Everywhere following the definition of the saints, and recognising the canon just recited of the CL. fathers of C.P., we decree respecting the privileges of the same new Rome," &c.; ye see that the fathers looked to nothing else in distributing the order of the patriarchal chairs than the civil rank of the cities and capitals (βασιλειῶν). For Alexandria seemed to be the capital of all Egypt, as Antioch was of the Assyrians, old Rome of Europe, and Constantinople of Asia, *having hierophants from the beginning, whom the Gentiles called Flamens*, as leading the rest of their false priests. I think it then just, and I propose,' concludes the same Meletius, 'that the throne of the orthodox city of Moscow should be and should be entitled a patriarchate, because it has been honoured by God to be the capital of this country and of all Russia; and that all the northern regions be subjected to the patriarchal chair of Moscow and all Russia, and that its holder should rank after the most holy patriarch of Jerusalem, and should be head and acknowledged as head over all the northern parts, *according to canon* xxxiv. *of the Apostles*, and be and be styled the Brother of the Orthodox Patriarchs, having the same rank and place as to his chair, their equal in order and dignity, and being specially commemorated like them in the sacred diptychs, and in the holy offertory, and in the other ecclesiastical assemblies.'[13] The holy synod consented to these same proposals, and decreed the same, namely, Jeremiah the most holy œcumenical patriarch [of C.P. that is], and Sophronius of Jerusalem, and the rest of the bishops, without any difference of opinion all subscribed. But enough of this question. Let us now return within the posts of our race-course (that is, to the subject of our history).

[13] The above is not strictly a quotation or extract. Compare the *Replies of Nicon*, p. 47-53. The synod in question was held at C.P. in A.D. 1593, and its acts were printed by Nicon in his *Skirjal* in A.D. 1655.

CHAP. XI. *Synodical meeting in the golden hall of the palace.*

But the foregoing questions were only as preludes before the great pentathlon and gymnastic contest, which was to come off, as in the amphitheatre, against the famous Nicon. So all met in the imperial palace; and the emperor, before the two patriarchs and the most sacred synod and the most splendid synclete, began with the following exordium [abridged here]:

'Solomon sent up hymns of praise when he had completed the temple; and Justinian when he had finished the eighth wonder of the world, the church of St. Sophia. What thanksgivings, then, should not I send up to the Most High for the sight and presence of this assembly of œcumenical patriarchs, metropolitans, archbishops, bishops, &c.? In truth, I shall be most happy if the work aimed after shall be brought to a good end, so that I procure peace to the Church, *or rather, I may say, to the empire*, which has been torn asunder, *like Penthεus and Osiris*, into many fragments, not to say also schisms. One thing only I well know and am sure of, namely, that God, the dispenser of blessings and the just rewarder of them who contend [*for Him*], will give abundantly a just recompense of everlasting blessings in the great day of restitution. To which eternal and unspeakable enjoyments may we all have the happiness to attain, through the intercessions and prayers of the great hierarchs of Moscow, Peter, Alexis, Jonah, and Philip, and of all the saints. Amen. So be it.' In which all joined, and responded together.

Then there were brought in into the midst *the two patriarchal tomes, which had been authenticated before and subscribed by the four œcumenical patriarchs*, viz. Kyr *Dionysius* of C.P., Paisius of Alexandria, Macarius of Antioch, and Nectarius of Jerusalem, *and translated about this time* (ἤδηπου) *from the Greek into Russ*[14] *by Paisius the metropolitan of Gaza. And there were read aloud from them the most important portions of their contents.* And after this reading the bishops present were asked by the most blessed patriarchs Paisius and Macarius *whether Nicon was* [*the person*] *obnoxious to judgment*[15] *in respect of the*

[14] Paisius, who had written the XXV. Questions sent in Greek to the patriarchs [and probably also the first draft of the Answers], translated their Answers into *Latin;* and his Latin was translated again into Russ.

[15] That is, was the person alluded to in the Questions sent to the four patriarchs, and to which they in these two documents had replied.

accusations made? All cried out aloud, '*Yes!*' And the first of them in rank, Pitirim, added that there were many *other offences also* for which Nicon had been found worthy of condemnation, though those contained in the above-mentioned portions of the patriarchal tomes were the more flagrant and important, in which he seems to be altogether guilty and liable to punishment. Then were read besides *some of the letters sent at different times.* And then, after much discussion and careful examination, there were handed to the patriarchs *divers libels containing the chief charges* against Nicon in a succinct form, whence a sort of spicilegium and compendium, a *tasteful essay* (*φιλοκαλία*), collecting and accumulating the charges brought against him (*τις φιλοκαλία ἴνζεν κάκιῦζιν σαρώσασα καὶ σωρεύσασα*), has been here put into the form of a single statement, as word for word is subjoined. (Do not be alarmed, dear readers, at its length; for there is no useless verbosity when only that is said which is necessary for the statement of the case, &c.) These things having been thus done and spoken, and the libels having been delivered to the patriarchs, to be studied by them in their apartments, the emperor named two of the Russian bishops to explain, superintend, and review (*διερμηνεύτας ἐφόρους καὶ ἀναζεωρήτας*) the charges against Nicon to the two œcumenical patriarchs, viz. Paul metropolitan of Kroutitz, and Hilarion archbishop of Riazan,—in the same way, one may say, in which, as Epiphanius relates (in *Hæres. Nazaræorum*), it was usual that there should be with the patriarch of the Jews certain assessors (called apostles), abiding constantly with him night and day, advising him, and supplying him with references to the enactments of the law. Both the patriarchs assented to this choice and proposal of the emperor, and expressed their satisfaction at it, as being most prudent and convenient. They added, however, *as a request of their own:* 'Do us the favour, O most serene monarch, to give us yet farther a third bishop *of our own tongue*, that is, *Paisius of Gaza, who is not ignorant of the affair of Nicon.*' '*He is yours from this moment*,' the emperor replied: '*From him ye can learn all with as much detail as you please.*' After this the assembly broke up; not, however, till they had been entreated to lose no time, but to set vigorously to work all of them, both in the way of reading and by diligent attention of mind, and that they should study the more important heads of that case of

Nicon which was to be examined: 'for the contest before us is great, and the pentathlon weighty and difficult.'

CHAP. XII. [*Summary of the*] *statements or libels of accusation presented to the two Patriarchs against Nicon* [*abridged from the diffuse tirade of Paisius*].

Hear, ye fatherhoods (πατριαὶ) of the nations, ye heads of the Churches, O most holy and divinely-promoted patriarchs! &c. &c. Hear, O most divine intelligences, rulers of the races [or fatherhoods, πατριῶν], princes of the tongues, superintendents of the tribes (for God has set according to the climes of the world one to have the care of each nation, as Daniel witnesses); give ear, O ye heavenly orders, and ye corresponding orders upon earth, heavenly men and earthly angels. 'Hear,' says Moses also, 'O heaven, and I will speak; give ear, O earth, to the words of my mouth;' invoking the elements themselves to be present as witnesses, because he knew that they would remain afterwards and for ever. For this cause also another prophet cried, saying, 'Hear, O altar;' since that king to whom he was sent was more senseless than the stones; for, though he saw the altar rent, he stretched out his hand against the prophet. . . . Like Moses, then, and like Isaiah, we call to witness all the elements and all the nations to knowledge and understanding. For I am about to reveal to you, the just judges, the unprincipled acts (ῥᾳδιουργίας), the nameless practices, the artifices, and the plots of the ex-patriarch of Moscow Nicon. For this kakiarch (*i.e.* patriarch of all that is bad), having been born of mean parents, lived first as a hired servant, being poorer than Irus [*i.e.* than any beggar]; and afterwards, having, beyond all hope, been raised to the lofty eminence of the patriarchal chair, he, with the mad ambition of Lucifer, impudently attempted to set his own chair above those of the other patriarchs, making wholesale onslaughts (ἀθρόως ἀποπειρώμενος), pondering all manner of schemes, occupied constantly with dishonest stratagems, contemning the most ancient privileges: and at last he appeared as a mule kicking his own benefactor,[16] and, as a viper, wounding with senseless ingratitude the great church of Christ, his own mother and nurse. . . . Plato called Aristotle 'the horse,' because he bit at his master. . . . So this senseless and *slothful hus-*

[16] His own *master* or *owner*, that is.

landman (ἀγεωργέων) Nicon may be called a horse which thought to oppose the œcumenical teachers who were before him. But he who takes the wise in their own craftiness, and who marvellously brings down those who exalt themselves and snort for the abundance of their wealth, swept away the evil and most vile plot of Nicon like a spider's web, when he wished to appear *beyond the rest* (ἐπεκτῖνα τῶν ἄλλων), as forsooth being outside [of the Turkish empire], and enjoying a prosperous establishment, and thinking to be styled and celebrated *pope*, archbishop, and patriarch, and determined to honour himself with this[17] swelling title, retaining no show of reverence for the ancient and true pope and patriarch of the great city of Alexandria, who had had this title from the beginning (and before St. Cyril represented Celestine in the fourth council of Chalcedon, when he was called a thirteenth apostle), as may be seen from the letter of Arius mentioned by Theodoret (in lib. i. of his *Eccl. Hist.* cap. v.). And not only so, but he directly (διαῤῥήδην) shoved and elbowed aside the patriarch of Jerusalem, writing himself patriarch of the new Jerusalem, heedless of the distinction laid down by Sophronius between the old Jerusalem of the Jews, the murderers of Christ, and the new, which is the mother of all the Churches. . . . Nor did he leave the chair of Antioch (where Peter and Paul, after the resurrection of Kissar and the baptism of the five thousand, had such great success, and gave the commencement to the Christian name) . . . unassailed, but plotted by all means to cast down this throne also, and to subject it as inferior to himself, seeking surreptitiously to filch from it the right of being ranked third[18] by a fraudulent subscription and a spurious document; being ignorant, wretched man, that to the bishop of Antioch alone, according to Theodore Balsamon, belongs specially and of right this title of patriarch. He committed a flagrant injury also against the œcumenical chair [of C.P.] *by seizing to himself the illustrious chair of Kieff*,[19] the first supreme metropolis of the apostle-like Vladimir, wishing to be commemorated publicly and styled thus, 'Nicon, by the mercy of God archbishop of Moscow, and of all Great, Little, and White Russia,' holding all the same privileges which the œcumenical chair (that is, the chair of C.P.) has obtained from

[17] The title not of 'pope,' but of 'great hossoudar,' μέγας αὐθέντης, is really alluded to.

[18] *Replies of Nicon*, p. 54.

[19] Ib. p. 158, and *Travels of Macarius patriarch of Antioch*, p. 281.

the holy synods, and holds canonically to this day. . . . But Nicon, who of grace and favour only had the name of patriarch, urged on by his own innate egotism, boasted himself in titles not his own and in borrowed plumes, like the jackdaw in the fable, accumulating to himself strange and unseemly titles, or rather heaping coals of fire on his own head, for his final condemnation.

However, Nicon devised a new sophism to digest his own inward malice (*πρὸς τὸ περιπέπτειν τὴν ἐνδόμυχον αὐτοῦ μοχθηρίαν*), namely this, that the patriarch of Alexandria and the patriarch equally of Antioch, in consequence of those cities having been made desolate by the calamitous changes of these times, and their not residing there, cannot be said to be truly and properly patriarchs, circumscribing judaically the authority by the place. . . . But this is not so. No; by no means. The grace of the Spirit is neither circumscribed by fences, nor shut in by cancelli: . . . for it is not the place that sanctifies the man, but the man that sanctifies the place, &c. From the time, then, that he entered upon this contest (*πύνταξλον*), devising plots, weaving mischiefs, suggesting words *manifestly originating from himself*, he overleaped all the former bounds, so that Nicon was *the only head to be heard of*; and, having fallen into a reprobate mind, he made bold to change the old customs and manners of C.P. and Alexandria, and Antioch and Jerusalem, and even of the former patriarchs of Moscow, not only by wearing red (*πόματα*) stripes on his mandya instead of blue, and by not mentioning publicly the name of the œcumenical patriarchs as before, but also by introducing novelties into the ritual forms and books, and by changing his robes in the divine liturgy. For having eighty-five sakkoses, that he might exhibit them, he put on in one liturgy twelve sakkoses one after another. And, that he might not seem to be inferior even to God himself, he introduced a monstrous idea of orders among his singers in the divine liturgy, calling some of the eldest youths seraphim[18] and cherubim, by whom he was attended within the awful sanctuary. He was constantly looking in the glass[19] and combing himself. He even made of the holy bema (the sanctuary) a fortress, or rather a

[18] There were stands or galleries at Voskresensk behind the iconostase for the singers, one above the other; and they mounted from the lower to the higher as the solemnity of the liturgy advanced. These 'quoirs' still remain.

[19] This is still done in Russia, that the long hair of the priest or bishop may not be disordered when he has the phenolion or the sakkos put over his head.

prætorium. To speak more correctly, he kept the monastic clerks in fetters, casting them there into chains on the spot, so that they could not escape, and again *taking prisoners out of their chains of his mere will and caprice.* What Jeremiah shall weep these things as they deserve, seeing the things of God despised and mocked by him? How many vain reproaches did his enemies vomit out against St. John Chrysostôm because he had struck or boxed the ear of a certain hierodiacon within the bema, as the accusers of the saint madly declared? But how much might not one say with truth against Nicon, who even kicks the clergy, and has profaned, as if open to all, the unapproachable[20] sanctuaries, and has made the all-pure table (*τράπεζα*) a scene for tragi-comedies, whence the whole rubbishing swarm of his innovations has had its beginning, disturbing the customs and fixed institutions of the Church, madly falling foul of the venerable mysteries as if they were fables: for he lawlessly marked with his obelus [as for omission] and set aside the triadic hymns composed by the most holy patriarch Metrophanes, and customarily sung on every Sunday; so showing himself an enemy of the supreme Trinity. St. John writes in the Apocalypse, 'If any man add to these words, God shall add to him all the woes that are written in this book.' In like manner also the apostle Paul cries aloud, 'Though an angel come from heaven and preach to you anything beyond what we have preached to you, let him be anathema.' And canon ii. of the Sixth council ordains that we remain stedfastly and immovably in all that the divinely-inspired fathers have framed for the healing of our souls, . . . following in the steps of Moses, who charged us beforehand that we are not to add anything whatever, nor to take anything away. How, then, shall Nicon do otherwise than incur a treble anathema? This man, when it was the order *throughout all the world* that the blessing of the water on the Theophany should be performed *twice*, once on the eve, and once on the day itself of the festival, commanded, contrary to the rule of the Church, that it should be performed only once; not perceiving that the word *σήμερον* (to-day), so often repeated in the prayer of the patriarch Sophronius, means the day itself of the festival. What man of common sense, then, will deny that Nicon is an innovator, subverting the order of the typicon and the ancient tradition of the Church?

[20] *Ἄβατα*, into which lay people may not enter.

This man *was ordained a second time* when he was made patriarch; and *he re-ordained two others who were bishops already* on occasion of their translation, contrary to canon lxvii. of the Apostles, which forbids re-ordaining, and deposes him that re-ordains any, together with them that he has ordained. For there are three sacraments which admit not of repetition, as conferring a seal, type, and place (citing Asterius bishop of Amasia on the parable of the two sons). . . . So Nicon must confess either that he was never ordained metropolitan of Novgorod, as if the *patriarch Joseph* was a heretic (which is false and absurd), or that, in consequence of his re-ordination afterwards, he never became a true patriarch, and also that all his ordinations are invalid. [See *Replies of Nicon*, p. 13-16.]

This man would not condescend to call the bishops whom he, with whatever validity or invalidity, had ordained his brethren [again quoting Asterius for the sense of this word 'brethren,' and Meletius in his epistle to the Russians]. . . . So, then, he is to be called a hater of his brethren, who showered on them ten thousand insults, and exposed to extraordinary affronts his own spiritual brethren, publicly striking, *as it were*, and rebuking to their faces his fellow bishops of the same blood with himself, contrary to all law and justice. For, according to the imperial laws and the patriarchal tomes, rough insult is usually estimated by considering both the person, and the place, and the thing [*i. e.* the act or matter of the offence]. This *contentious Nicon*, then, was not ashamed most impudently to call the local assembly of the bishops a 'synagogue,' when in time past, by the act of such a synagogue, he was made to appear as put out of the synagogue. [See *Replies of Nicon*, p. 61-65, and 40-43, 99-101; 603.]

This man, when messengers were sent to him from the absolute autocrat (παντάνακτος), and from the synod itself, made a tragi-comic scene in the church, and reproached orthodox bishops, comparing them to Annas and Caiaphas who presided over the Jews in the murder of Christ. And shall not a man of such prodigious insolence be punished with the [due] canonical penalties? Or shall not he fall under the heaviest condemnation who upon the very ambon insults his fellow pontiffs and fellow bishops, who are the eyes of the Church, conducting himself shamelessly without cause in the church and in the sanctuary? Insult done to another becomes greater, as they say, geometrically

and analogically, and becomes heavier according to its quantity and quality. But as for him, it is not enough for him to insult by word and by writing us who are still living on the earth, but he must needs vilify also the great bishops who were before him, not to say also *religious emperors* who had departed this life, giving no heed to that word of the Lord, 'Whoso curseth father or mother, let him die the death;' nor remembering the oracle of St. Paul that 'he that is dead is justified:' wherefore also in our commemorations of them we designate them as those who have fallen asleep and departed by a happy end. 'Let the memory,' says my intelligent friend *Synesius* (*συνετὸς Συνέσιος*), 'of the dead be honoured, since their end ought to be accounted a sort of festival and holy celebrity for such as have departed hence to the Lord.' [See above, p. 80; and *Replies of Nicon*, p. 669, 670.]

Yet again: This irreligious man had his own portrait put in the church while still living this uncertain and corruptible life, making himself even before his death *nearly* equal with the saints, wearing on his head *something like* a golden fillet (*πέταλον*), a premature anticipation of the aureole of glory, the faithful symbol of imperishable blessedness. Knew he not, the wretched man, how prone to slip is human nature? 'Hold what thou hast,' the Lord says, 'that no man take thy crown.' And Solon, one of the seven wise men, says that no one is to be called happy before his death.... And Solomon... and Pindar... and Gregory the Divine. Who was more religious (*ὁσιώτερος*) than *Hosius* of Corduba, who represented Sylvester of Rome in the synod of Nice? yet he afterwards miserably slid into the gulf of Arianism... And lastly Moses, for the water of strife alone, was excluded and denied the desired land of promise. And Solomon in his old age had so completely lost the gift of prophecy that he could not understand and read the books. And Titus, who besieged Jerusalem, and was called the Delight of the World... when he grew old turned aside to pleasures and passions, &c. [See above the note at p. 21.]

No man knows what the morrow will bring forth. Only Nicon of all men took no heed whatever of this future and of its uncertainty: he considered not what was likely to come to pass. And so he claimed to be styled, and to be addressed in writing, Great Hossoudar [See *Replies*, &c. p. 66], ambitiously coveting a title rather civil than ecclesiastical, properly belonging to secular

rulers, pluming and boasting himself in a word beyond the patriarchal greatness, and altogether foreign to the profession of a bishop, to the dignity of a teacher; taking to himself privileges altogether new and improper, and as far as possible from having been given by the holy œcumenical synods, which had proscribed beforehand every sort of assumption as damaging the identity of the ecclesiastical honour, and had embraced heartily and most prudently humility, the mother of the virtues, &c. But if Meletius of Alexandria says that, for the sake of edification and unity, every one ought to do his best to remove whatever scandalises and troubles the Church of God, and precipitates souls into hell, and we ought to strive to banish all faction and contention, how much more ought we to put away such things as produce all manner of vain-glory, and root them out, with the pride which they cause, as breaking up the simple concord of the spiritual brotherhood into which we have all been baptised, and in which we have been trained! But O, the audacity! Alas, the folly! O, the savage ferocity! The most ancient patriarchs used modestly and simply their own styles and titles, as may be seen in the acts of the holy synods; as Pope Agatho in his epistle to the three emperors (in the Sixth council in Trullo) writes 'my leastness' (ἐλαχιστία) and 'our littleness' (σμικρότης); and his three legates subscribed as the 'representatives of the most religious and most holy bishop of the elder Rome Agatho.' Also in the first act of this synod we read that there had come to it 'George the most religious and most holy archbishop of C.P. new Rome, and Macarius the most religious archbishop of Antioch.' But go *now*, and write a patriarch merely 'most religious' (ὁσιώτατος), when every simple hieromonach will be put out if he is not styled 'most entirely religious' (πανοσιώτατος); as Nicon too, with the rest, who, not content with 'most blessed' and 'most entirely holy' (μακαριώτατος and παναγιώτατος), glorified himself with the title of 'great hossoudar' (μέγας αὐθέντης), contrary to all law and right. O golden years of the past! O golden age of humility! whereas our age is not of gold, but of brass, in respect of the boastful ambition of titles. However, if we would be a little accurate in our expressions in styling the patriarchs, we might call three apostolic thrones 'most blessed' (μακαριωτάτους), as having been made blessed by the martyrdoms of their apostles; and the others should be 'most

holy' (ἁγιώτατος), for the sake of their apostles without local martyrdom. . . . The patriarch of Moscow therefore cannot in strictness be 'most blessed,' but only 'most holy,' since the metropolis of the Russians (or rather of the Sauromatæ) was sanctified by St. Andrew, who planted there the first cross. But if the bishop of Cyprus is also to be called 'most blessed' for the sake of Barnabas, in whose tomb was found the original gospel and its translation, both written by the evangelist St. Matthew with his own hand, though he may have obtained and enjoyed this title once, he has it now no longer. For the titles of the patriarchs have been settled since in each patriarchate for the sake of order: else, if every one could take to himself the titles of the rest, there would be a confusion worse than the fabulous chaos. . . . It is not lawful therefore for thee, O Nicon, it is not lawful for thee to multiply proudly thy titles, and to filch unjustly privileges which have not been given thee by the synod at C.P. on account of thy numberless cities, on account of thy vast territory, extending to the shores of the ocean. For neither does the most holy patriarch of Antioch move the landmarks of the fathers which they have set up for ever, though he had as many episcopal sees under him from of old as there were fishes taken in the net which Peter drew to land, viz. one hundred fifty and three, and as there were chapters in our old Euchologion. Still, he has the sense not to magnify himself with these swelling titles of thine (and he does well); though he has under him four catholicoses, of Persia, of Armenia Major, of Iberia, and of the country now called Katactonia. And thou, O Paul, immaterial pipe of the Holy Ghost, writest: 'It was fit that we should have such a high priest,' &c.; and elsewhere, in thine epistle to Timothy, thou describest the qualifications of a bishop thus: 'A bishop should be,' &c. 'not given to wine' (μὴ παροῖνον), that is, according to Ecumenius, not self-willed and overbearing, clear-sighted, fervent in spirit, for the edification of the people and the oversight of the Church, and not going about from one see to another, which looks like adultery. Yet no one of these fair qualifications of a bishop did Nicon ever possess or show; but, on the contrary, he loved covetousness and filthy lucre; and the love of money, which is the root of all evils, as some young damsel, he took to his bosom to be his consort. Whom ever of the naked did Nicon clothe with a garment?

He stripped men; he did not clothe them. What stranger did he take care for? What poor wretch lying in prison did he kindly visit? He expelled them indeed [from Moscow], but he did nothing to win them. He dragged thousands to dark dungeons, and was not known to free any of them from humanity. To whom of the bishops was he ever readily bountiful, he the unmerciful? Or whom of strangers from abroad did he ever invite to a friendly visit or to a banquet, he the hard-hearted, the iron-souled, to gratify or comfort them with kindness, or to show them honour? Thus Nicon was unhealable, incurable, not to be recovered from his vices. Who is wise, and he shall understand how to describe his intrigues, his recklessness, his luxury, his ambuscades, his conspiracies, his factious partisanships. He was energetic in founding and walling towns or castles, and villages and monasteries, expending vainly and unprofitably the revenues of the patriarchal church, seeking rather to be famed as the holder and founder of towns and new monasteries, and as a new *Melchisedec* of his own new Jerusalem, *seizing lawlessly the lands of the surrounding proprietors*,[21] their villages, and their pastures, for the greater extension and magnificence of his foundations. Alas for his insatiable soul! Ah, woe for his evil disposition, really like to the all-devouring jaws of hell! For from the time that he had waxed too fat, he became [like Jeshurun] thick and broad (ἐπαχύνθη καὶ ἐπλατύνθη) in heart. Then it was, then, that he abandoned God who had made him what he was, and was himself afterwards wholly abandoned of Him, by a certain divine permission. For from the time that he rejected the service of the Lord, the Most High also, by a certain just misfortune (κακοπάθειαν), put him out from the priesthood. Having been ever blamable and an imaginer of unseasonable things (ἀκαιροφάνταστος), he lived counting his money, measuring his costly furs from Siberia, shouting like a bacchanal for the courts of civil and criminal jurisdiction, and for the prisons [so well] becoming the patriarch (εὐϊῶν τὰ κριτήρια [καὶ] τὰ πρέποντα τῷ πατριάρχῃ δικαωτήρια), giving up none [of his own people] to be judged, but committing himself all judgment to laymen, who are used to sell the scales of justice. Wherefore also the just God, the recompenser, allowed his right

[21] Alluding to Iv. Sitin and Rom. Babarikin. But the lands seized *by them* were afterwards restored to Voskresensk. See *Replies*, &c. p. 67-94; 581-601.

hand to be withdrawn from Nicon [so as no longer to protect or restrain him]; whereupon he ran headlong into the pit which he had dug with his own hands; and, like another Haman, he was hanged on his own gallows which he had prepared for Mordecai. For the Lord sometimes smites with folly him whom he will destroy, giving here also the weights of retribution. It is a proverb that the foolish man is his own enemy. And such did Nicon exhibit himself, the new Epimetheus, lost in the grossest folly and utter imprudence, since he rushed forward and threw himself headlong into Scylla and Charybdis, without consulting previously any of the bishops who were friendly to him about the course to be taken, but acting with unhesitating confidence upon his own evil counsel alone. And so he did all that he did, acts full of madness, full of folly, worthy of the derision of Democritus. But why do I loiter, and not hasten to the fact, to the drama that was acted? He entered into the great church full of wrath and pride; and, after the celebration of the sacred liturgy, he put off all his episcopal robes, deposing himself, and exhibiting himself, as one might say, in the act of suicide. . . . The Greek Hercules, among his other twelve labours, had to cleanse the stables of Augeas; and when he had seen the quantity of filth and smelt the stench, he turned the river into it, and by that clever device cleansed the stable. A harder task even than that is before me in the conduct of Nicon, which exceeds all the worst stories of misconduct. But I will commit to you who are the life-giving rivers the map of his conduct, invoking to its examination and trial God the observer and searcher of all, that he may give the most straight and right decision, after great consideration and investigation on the part of the patriarchs. [See *Replies*, &c. p. 31, 96, 22, 104, 292-423, 463-604.]

CHAP. XIII. *How Nicon was summoned by the Synod, and came, and appeared before it.*

All the bishops assembled together; and after much examination and discussion, this also was made a question, whether it was necessary that Nicon should be synodically summoned and appear, in order that he might answer to such questions as should be put to him by the synod, according to the usual order of proceeding in criminal and civil causes. And some indeed were well pleased with the decision of the patriarchal tomes,

which distinctly signified that it was by no means necessary to make any such summons, *as the charges against him* were *already* clearly established *by trustworthy* (ἀξιοπίστων) *persons and witnesses*, against whom nobody[22] could object. And the philosophers say that processes ought not to be multiplied without cause or necessity. Nevertheless it was the voice of the majority, and it prevailed, that it was *by all means necessary* that Nicon should be summoned, and should appear before the synod in order to a just condemnation, *or*, it might be, *a legitimate justification of himself*. And in support of this opinion there was adduced act viii. of the Sixth œcumenical synod, which says that 'at the veil (that is, the hanging at the door) there stand some of the bishops, hieromonachs, and deacons; and we ask if it pleases your divinely-wise dominion and the holy synod that they should enter? And the emperor Constantine and the holy synod said, Let the men enter: and they entered.' Arius was cited synodically. So too was Macedonius, as many as ten times. Nestorius was summoned thrice; and Dioscorus of Alexandria was thrice summoned by three bishops. And in the Fifth council, since Origen was not living on earth, his writings were presented formally to the synod, and were delivered over to an everlasting anathema. So also the Sixth council anathematised the Monothelite heretics who were dead, viz. Sergius, Pyrrhus, and Paul of C.P., yea, and Honorius Pope of Rome, and Cyrus of Alexandria, though they had long before departed out of this world.

So, in the presence of our most serene autocrat Kyr Kyr Alexis Michaelovich, in the golden hall of the palace, the most holy patriarchs Paisius and Macarius presiding, and all the most sacred bishops being present, and all the most splendid synclete, a decree was passed that Nicon, heretofore patriarch of Moscow, should be cited to appear to give answer to the question, For what cause he had left his chair? The decree which was sent ran thus: 'The most blessed patriarchs Kyr Paisius &c., and Kyr Macarius &c., and all the most sacred synod of the bishops, call thee to come to this great capital city of Moscow without delay, and to appear personally before us [to answer for thyself] respecting certain spiritual matters. Be not disobedient to this

[22] Here another hand has written in the margin ἀναξιοπίστων, *i. e.* '*un*trustworthy.' And this should be one of the *suite* at least of the patriarch Paisius of Alexandria. See above another marginal note of the same person at p. 89.

summons; but come in a humble manner. Thus we charge thee to do.' There was sent with this decree the archbishop of Pskoff Arsenius, with two other ecclesiastics, *archimandrites*, Sergius of Yaroslaff and Paul of Souzdal, to Nicon's monastery of Voskresensk (*i.e.* of Christ's resurrection). But Nicon, having insolently shut the doors, not only did not receive them that were sent, but also, as highly indignant, sent them away, saying, 'I will not come voluntarily,[23] but by imperial compulsion perhaps I may. What I have now said I have said according to that psalm of David: "I said, I will keep my ways, that I offend not with my tongue: I have set a watch to my mouth."' So they that had been sent departed without any success from the monastery, and drove straight back to Moscow, and made their report of all that had passed to the patriarchs.

On this account the most holy patriarchs and the most sacred synod of the bishops met again, and immediately decreed a second citation according to the divine canons, viz. that Nicon was to come immediately to the capital city of Moscow, and to come in humble guise, and appear with no more than ten attendants before the holy synod. The same commissioners went again to notify this decree; and Nicon this time did not disobey, but having performed the office for the unction of oil with prayer (the εὐχέλαιον), and having been himself anointed therewith, and having anointed those who were with him, he celebrated the divine liturgy, *in which he made commemoration only of Parthenius patriarch of Constantinople.* And after this he prepared himself[24] to enter into the contest. And so, according to the prescription of the decree, he arrived in Moscow; and for a lodging there was assigned him the house of the metropolitan Theodosius, where he remained with all his attendants *under a guard of soldiers*, for greater security and for safe custody.

CHAP. XIV. *How Nicon appeared personally before the most sacred Synod.*

On the 1st [really 3d] Dec. at sunrise, by command of the emperor, all of us bishops met in the heaven-roofed palata [the Krestovaya palata of the patriarchate], in the name of our Lord and Master Jesus Christ, our God and Saviour. And there,

[23] Being prejudged, and insulted by the manner in which he was summoned.

[24] *i.e.* he prepared himself bodily to set out for this end, as he had first prepared himself spiritually.

our emperor himself presiding, there assembled the metropolitans, to wit, Pitirim of Novgorod, Laurentius of Kazan, Jonah of Rostoff, Paul of Kroutits, Paisius of Gaza, Theodosius of Varsavion [of Servia], Gregory of Nicæa, Cosmas of Amasia, *Athanasius of Iconium*, Philotheus of Trebizond, Theophanes of Chios; the archbishops Ananias of Sinai, Simon of Vologda, Philaret of Smolensk, Hilarion of Riazan, Joasaph of Tver, Joseph of Astrachan, Arsenius of Pskoff; the bishops Alexander of Viatka (Βεάσκης), Lazarus of Chernigoff, Methodius of Mstislaff, and Joachim of Slaviansk. These all sat on the right side. And on the left the most glorious kniazes and boyars, viz. Nicetas Odoefsky, Gregory Cherkassky, George Dolgoruky, Ivan Prozoroffsky, the boyar (ἄρχων) Peter Soltikoff, the okolnik Bogdan Chitroff, the okolnik Herodion [Streshneff], and very many others of the grandees (περιφήμων) and the princes (πρικίων), in dignity sat in order. And thereupon Nicon was called, who had come to the imperial court sitting in a carriage (a sledge), with the cross borne before him and his episcopal staff borne aloft, as he himself had directed. And he having recited the Ἄξιον ἐστὶν κ.τ.λ., and having wished many years in the usual way to the emperor, a sign was made to him to sit in the *usual* place (ἐπὶ τόπον εἰθισμένον). But he demanded a seat like those of the two patriarchs, considering himself to be a judge, and by no means a man under condemnation [or come to be condemned, κατακρινόμενον]. And he gravely blamed the emperor about the seat, saying, 'Though for myself I am not come hither to sit in honour, but to answer, as has been notified to me, to your questions, still thou oughtest, O Christian emperor Alexis, to have honoured the patriarchal rank and to have reverenced it, as is decent and just.' Then *both the patriarchs* said: 'Is this, then, Nicon, on account of whom for eight years and more all Muscovy has been in commotion, and the *Eastern Church* has suffered *intolerable evils*, and the *four patriarchates have been in danger*, and on account of his single person have all but been overthrown and desolated (ἀνάστατα)? And dost thou demand a chair? Rememberest thou not that to sit is reserved to a judge, and belongs not to a man who is *being condemned* (κατακρινόμενον). We read in act xvii. of the synod held against Photius that when Photius came in with his staff the vicars of Nicholas Pope of Rome immediately cried out,

"Take the staff out of his hand; for it is a sign of the pastoral dignity, of which he is unworthy;" and so immediately Photius was deprived of the pastoral staff.[25] It is not therefore for thee to sit now, being under accusation, and in the act of being condemned (*κατακρινόμενον*), but to stand[26] upright on thy feet, and to answer for thyself: wherefore also the God-man Jesus sitteth at the right hand of God and the Father, who before also was found sitting among the doctors, and he shall yet again sit upon a throne to judge the quick and the dead and all nations. And Isaiah, the most loud-voiced of the prophets, says, "I saw the Lord sitting upon a throne, high, and lifted up." And it was the traditionary rule *for the Areopagites* to judge sitting, and to hear both sides equally in their place of judgment, viz. the accuser and the accused. And Moses, as he testifies in Exodus, says that he cannot endure that malefactors should live, but judges them according to just judgment. And this was signified by that command in the law not to eat the blood, that is, not to put a man to death unjustly or without sufficient cause, nor to delight in human blood, like blood-thirsty wild beasts, since they that are judges have to fight only against guilt, and by no means against human nature. For this reason they sit on a seat, as if to show the calmness of their heart and the undisturbed state of their mind.' Nicon *was persuaded by these words*, and *so*, standing in the midst, heard the questions which were put to him.

First, then, he was asked by the two patriarchs why he left his patriarchal chair, and went away into the wilderness, as if repeating the saying [of the Psalmist] to remain hid there (*καταβιῶσαι*)? And he answered, 'On account of the very great anger of the emperor, and his wrath (*μῆνιν*), which was waxing fierce against me, which was unmistakably made known to me by his, the emperor's, not having come to either of the two customary great festivals of our Lady of Kazan and of

[25] As therefore Photius had then been prejudged by his ecclesiastical superior Pope Nicholas, and the synod was held at C.P. only to give greater local weight and effect to a condemnation already valid, so now Nicon has been prejudged by his superior Alexis, and the synod is held not with any idea of his possibly clearing himself, but only to give greater weight to a condemnation already valid. But this speech of the patriarchs is probably a mere figment of Paisius, whom, as he says, they had asked to have for their interpreter and instructor, and whose style betrays him wherever he puts words into the mouths of others.

[26] But see Shusherin's account of the same matter.

the holy Tunic of the Lord, and still more by his not immediately causing trial to be made and justice done against Bogdan Matvéevich, who had struck my servant.' To this the emperor replied (standing uncovered in the midst, as if under accusation) that 'he had been unable to go to the church on the festivals named, as he needed the time for imperial cares, and was prevented by press of business of state: for indeed the office of governing is a thing full of many cares, implicated and occupied about ten thousand labyrinth-like concerns.' Here, looking at the two patriarchs, and seeing them standing (for they had risen, that he might not be standing before them while they were seated); the most serene autocrat said: '*It is for me now to stand*, O most blessed patriarchs, *as being called in question by my father Nicon; but do ye sit as judges and successors of the apostles*, to whom the Lord said, "Ye shall sit on thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel." Sit, O most holy patriarchs, and hear quietly the heads of what is objected to me and the seals of my answers.' Both the œcumenical patriarchs were persuaded to sit down; and the emperor, taking up the words of Nicon, said: 'So then thou sayest, O father, that it was on my account only that thou madest that abdication of the patriarchal chair? *I should have expected you* [in that case] *to testify to this effect* against me before all the clergy and before all the laity, who were present in such numbers.' 'Yes,' said Nicon; 'but I knew thee to be a monarch, irascible, and very much angered against me; and thence as a man I feared; and against my own will, in a manner, I retired on account of thee from the patriarchal chair.' 'Very good,' said the emperor: 'but yet when thou didst abdicate thy patriarchal chair, thou didst never nor in any way introduce any such reason, but, when asked, didst only say that thou didst leave thy chair, and retire to the place of penitents, simply for some washing away and expiation of thine own sins; as may be seen at once from the letters sent by thyself, in which also thou didst write thyself "*late* patriarch" and "*very great sinner*:" wherefore thou saidst thou hadst no thought ever again to return to the envied chair of ambition, for that this would be (such was thine expression) like the dog returning again, according to the proverb, to his vomit; but didst desire only that as soon as possible an election should be made and the votes canonically given for him

whom the Most High had preordained. Now the wise Solomon somewhere says that "a strong snare for a man are his own lips, and every one shall be taken by the words of his own mouth." It is vain to repeat that verse:[27] *ἡ γλῶσσ' ὀμώμοχ', ἡ δὲ φρὴν ἀνώμοτος* ("My tongue only swore, but my mind is unsworn"); for else all the contracts of society will dissolve into nothing, and will vanish like smoke into the air.'[28]

The patriarchs objected to him, 'Then didst thou *not* make abdication?' Nicon replied, 'I made it in my own sense; and like Martyrius of Antioch, in the time of the emperor Zeno, who, when the people of Antioch were disobedient and given up to all sorts of provoking jests and raillery, refused to remain their pastor. Nevertheless, since he did this only verbally [it did not really vacate his chair].'

And the patriarchs answered against this: 'As we understand, thou sayest that because thou didst not make thy [formal and] perfect resignation in writing, thou hadst by no means completed it in the fullest sense. Nevertheless Tryphon, according to the Chronographer, being patriarch of C.P., gave a written resignation of the œcumenical chair to the metropolitan of Cæsarea, who trapped him through the *clever* stratagem of telling him that he was ridiculed as a man altogether unlettered, and so ignorant that he could not even write his own name. See here, *brother*, you have a resignation made in writing, but obtained by fraud, and subscribed altogether involuntarily. But the unwritten abdication has an attestation, which cannot be passed over in silence, in the surrounding people. *Therefore thy* unwritten abdication, which was made publicly, has greater force than any written resignation got up in private apartments secretly and perhaps fraudulently, plainly because it was uttered personally by thyself in presence of the whole church full of people. But this point shall again at another time be more clearly examined into.

'For the present do thou now thyself answer respecting the slanders and calumnies patched together against *our* emperor,

[27] So Alexis in the synod has time to quote Greek plays to Nicon: but everything is Paisius throughout; and we must take nothing from him on trust, neither word nor fact; but sift all carefully, believing only that which is checked and verified from other sources.

[28] Compare Nicon's own account of his retirement in his *Replies*, pp. 21, 104, 595.

and sent with thy subscription to the œcumenical patriarch' (*i.e.* the patriarch of C.P. Dionysius]. Nicon, not being aware that his letters had been *intercepted*, said, 'Let my letters be produced:' and produced they were, being, as it were, letters of information [and consultation] from him inscribed to the patriarch of C.P. Kyr Dionysius, to the patriarch of Jerusalem Kyr Nectarius, and to the patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch, now present [at Moscow], Kyr Paisius and Kyr Macarius. They were read; and in them Nicon was found to speak of the most potent emperor Kyr Kyr Alexis Michaelovich as having apostatised and departed from the doctrines and instructions of his ancestors. Besides this he compared him to Jeroboam, and distinctly called him a perpetrator of injustice, and a spoiler of ecclesiastical rights and property. And he inserted together with these another farther reproach, namely, that he had set up a court over the monks [*i.e.* over the bishops and monasteries and their properties], such as had never before been opened by other autocrats. He introduced besides this too, together with other charges, in those letters, that *all the boyars* of the synclete had fallen away *to the doctrines of the Pope*, on account of Paisius metropolitan of Gaza, the papolater, whom he also called repeatedly a great heretic. Nevertheless, being desired by him to specify and expose the heresy of the metropolitan of Gaza, Nicon said that in point of fact he had belched out this calumnious imputation at that time through human passion; that is, because Paisius did not depart from Moscow quite so soon as Nicon wished, but stayed on there *without returning to his own see*, only, as was clear, to work up the case against him, and was making war upon him in innumerable writings.

The most blessed patriarchs bade read that section [of the Nomocanon] which enacts that the emperor is not to be insulted. Hereupon there was brought in the book of Matthew Blastar, who writes in title ii. ch. vii. word for word as follows: 'Canon lxxxiv. of the Apostles says, Whoever shall insult the emperor or the governor without just cause, if he be a clerk is to be deposed, and if a layman to be excommunicated. For the Mosaic law enjoins, Thou shalt not speak evil of the ruler of thy people. And Peter, the apex of the apostles, says, Honour the king. And the great Paul bids to pray for kings and all that are in authority, and that though they were unbelievers. By putting

in the words "without just cause" (for I have transcribed the sacred canon without change) he has cut off unbecoming insult, but not righteous rebuke, when any one applies it to those who do acts beyond their duty or competency (καθῆκον) and such rebuke is taken for insult. The civil laws also enact that he who finds any abuse of the emperor written on paper sealed or unsealed, and does not immediately burn it, but reads it [aloud], is to be punished in the same way as if he had been the author of the abuse.' The bishops cried out with a loud voice, 'Let Nicon, then, be punished according to the laws. For blessed Peter wrote in his Catholic Epistle (ch. ii.): Fear God, honour the king. And Paul says: He that resisteth the power resisteth the ordinance of God: for he beareth not the sword in vain. For he is a minister of God. And yet at that time the ruler was the most impious Nero, a tyrant with the disposition of a savage beast, for whom the divine apostles bade the Christians make prayer and intercession to God. But Nicon not only did not reverence and honour our orthodox autocrat, but we even see with our eyes libels written [by Nicon] against him, and sent to the œcumenical patriarchs, vituperating him, calling him a heretic who is most pious, a Jeroboam who is a meek David, a tyrant who is most scrupulously just, a rapacious confiscator who is profusely liberal and a distributor of all manner of benefits; so that he appears distinctly caballing against our most excellent emperor, exhibiting himself self-condemned before the patriarchates as a forger of libels. For Tertullian also, who flourished almost in the times of the apostles, writes, referring to the emperor of old Rome: We reverence the monarch after the most high God, as being the representative of God upon earth. Therefore Nicon is destitute of all excuse or fair defence, as having disturbed not only the clergy but even the empire, *yea, and all the synclete.* And he who disturbs the empire is altogether inexcusable, according to canon xii. of the synod held at Antioch; unless any one should venture to say that when he wrote those letters he was out of his mind. For in that case, according to Matthew Blastar, he may find mercy and be pardoned by the sovereign. He who insults the emperor, he says, is not necessarily to be forthwith executed or made to suffer some other severe punishment; for it may be, he either spoke of mere levity, and is to be despised, or of insanity, and

is to be pitied, or as suffering wrong, and then allowance is to be made: but the case is referred to the emperor; and he, according to the quality of the person, judges whether he is to be pardoned or punished.'

'What then, pray,' said the synclete, 'is he to suffer, O most holy patriarchs, who dishonours his own flock, and falsely calls it heretical, and in fact lost? Nicon, unless he can show and prove this accusation in the clearest manner, cannot be called a true and good shepherd, but is only a hireling, a man of *darkness*, not an *overseer*, (an epi*scotos*, not an epi*scopos*): since the true shepherd ought to watch over his own sheep and lay down his own life for his flock, having been intrusted with the charge of it from above. But Nicon not only left his flock untended, leaving for nine whole years the patriarchal chair in widowhood and the Church bereaved, but now also he slanderously accuses all to the œcumenical patriarchs, an act unworthy and improper for any bishop.'

'Let the book of laws [τὸ Νόμμον, the Nomocanon] then,' said the patriarchs, 'be brought in and read, in which is contained the duty and the description of the patriarch in nearly these words:

'A patriarch is a living and animated image of Christ, by deeds and words exhibiting in himself the features of the truth. The aim of the patriarch is, first, to preserve those who are committed to him of God in piety and good manners; then also, according to his ability and opportunity, to convert all the heretics also to orthodoxy, and to the unity of the Church (but heretics who are so called by the laws and the canons are they who do not communicate with the Catholic Church); and yet farther, by striking the unbelievers also with his exemplary and conspicuous and admirable conduct, to make them imitators of the faith. The object to be proposed to himself by the patriarch is, the salvation of the souls committed to him, to live to Christ, to be crucified to the world. The characteristics of a patriarch are these: to be apt to teach; to adapt himself to all, high and low, with facility; to be gentle to all who come to him and converse with him, instructing them; but to be *capable of rebuking and confuting the disobedient*, and *in the cause of truth and justice to speak even before kings* without being ashamed.'

There was read besides from Matthew Blastar (title v.) the

chapter 'About Bishops,' which says that 'it belongs to the character of a bishop to be ready to expose himself the first to danger on behalf of his people, to comfort his flock when afflicted, and to regard as his own the affliction or distress of those under him;' and the like.

'Therefore,' the patriarchs said, 'Nicon, who unjustly and absurdly calumniates his own flock, and writes falsely that all, small and great, have turned aside to the doctrines of the Pope of Rome (whom, notwithstanding, Nicon himself *sought very busily to have for his judge*, and by no means us, the Eastern patriarchs, from whom he had the patriarchal blessing and ordination, as is prescribed by canon ii. of the Second œcumenical council, which witnesses that the chairs of the Pontic and Thracian dioceses, besides the Asian, are subject to that of C.P., and farther the places also in the parts of the barbarians, that is, the regions of the Sauromatæ in the North, or all the northern parts, as Meletius of Alexandria, in his epistle to Gideon of Leopolis, interprets it),—Nicon, then, is not a true shepherd; nor did he enter through the true spiritual door; but he has manifested himself to be altogether a hireling and a robber, who has crept in to slay and destroy the flock. Wherefore he is to be deposed, as a slanderer of his own wife, that is, of his flock, whose honour he has not guarded, but has only dishonoured her, as if she were an adulteress and a strumpet.'

Nicon was questioned farther why he had anathematised the metropolitan Pitirim on the Sunday of Orthodoxy? He replied, 'Because he had sat on the ass in the procession on Palm Sunday; and also *because he was in the habit of omitting my name from the diptychs* (though I was no heretic), making no mention of it in celebrating; and farther he was in the habit of ordaining priests and deacons without my knowledge.' After much disputing, the conclusion of the discussion was this: that all these things had been done after Nicon's public abdication, and after Pitirim had been by common consent elected to be the superintendent and vicar of the patriarchate; and that therefore he had been free to act as he did, taking the privileges which belonged to his position, and conferring ordinations in due course, as being the patriarchal vicar, and holding the place of the patriarch.

Now, however, for the shortness of the time [available, the days being very short in December], and owing to there having

been a vast deal of talking to no purpose on both sides, the conference broke up, the patriarchs saying to Nicon, 'Go home, *brother;* and in another meeting we will, with God's help, make fuller investigation, and with careful consideration will finish the matter.'

I had nearly forgotten to say that at the end of this first meeting an incident occurred which deserves to be noticed. Two archimandrites, Philaret of Vladimir and Sergius of Yaroslaff, stepped forth into the midst, and began to speak in the synod, justifying [the tsar and the court] against Nicon. But immediately Nicon turned upon them, saying, 'In what synod, pray, are archimandrites also to be found acting *as judges* (δικάζοντες) and condemning?' And Kyr Paisius of Alexandria replied, 'There is *not* here *any synod* about the *faith*, but merely a simple *trial:* and in the court [or tribunal, κριτήριον] every one is free to appear and to defend or accuse. Who knows, then, for what cause this archimandrite has come forward publicly, whether it be to speak in favour of either side, or to invalidate some witness?' Kyr Macarius also spoke, and added, that archimandrites and hegoumens *were present* in the œcumenical synods, as is plain from the synodal acts. And thereupon the acts were read. And there were found to have been present in the Fourth œcumenical synod 630 persons, of whom 520 were bishops, and the remaining 110 all archimandrites and hegoumens. It is made credible too, and appears from the epistle to Pope Leo of Rome, that in like manner in the Fifth and in the Sixth and in the Seventh œcumenical councils there were present of archimandrites and hegoumens not a few. Nor let any one object in favour of Nicon that the patriarch Joseph of C.P. [at Florence] would by no manner of means let the hegoumens subscribe synodically; nay, he did not even let them give their votes (γνωμοδοτῆσαι). For that most well-informed patriarch said thus with special reference only to the unordained hegoumens, but not of such as had been ordained publicly. For before it was usual at C.P. that the emperor should give to the hegoumen elect the legal investiture (τὸ δεκανίκιον), after receiving which he went to the patriarch and was ordained; and then he had the right, in virtue of his dignity of hegoumen, to sit with [the rest] and to give his judgment: and he joined in ratifying the determinations of the synod, as has been noticed by the great ecclesiarch Sylvester Syropulus in his work on the council of Florence.

CHAP. XV. *How Nicon was synodically condemned in the second act [or session].*

In the same year and month, Wednesday [Dec. 5], Nicon was again summoned by two bishops and two archimandrites; and he again came with the gilt cross and the pateritsa; and, having made the usual prayer, and the polychronion over the emperor, he stood in the midst, while the patriarchs sat, and all the bishops, being twenty-two in number, and all the rest of the grandees of the senate [the kniazes and boyars, ἄρχοντες], around the emperor. The emperor stepping down from his throne, again stood on his feet erect in the midst, as if about to defend himself.

Thereupon Kyr Paisius of Alexandria began with an exordium to this effect: 'Nothing in the world is sweeter than truth, nor more desirable than strict equality (ἰσότητος) . . . In truth, every one who doeth and speaketh falsehood has for his father the devil. But *it is not for long that the light of* unerring *truth can be hidden by the deceptive clouds of foul falsehood.* It soon breaks out again and shines, and at once dispels the mists. "Wine is strong," once said Zorobabel; "*the king also is strong;* and a woman is stronger than he: *nevertheless, after all, the strongest of all things is truth:*" as we read in the third book of Esdras. And the inspired David prophesied of the just man: "His truth shall encompass thee with a buckler;" as indeed the truth [of God] did encompass David when he fled from Saul, Jacob when he was wronged of Laban, Mardochai when he was envied and slandered by Haman. *So the truth will defend and save thee also, O brother Nicon,* and encompass thee, securing thee as a panoply; only speak the truth, turning aside in nothing from the straight path. For if, according to Malachi, the priest's lips lie not, how shall the lips of a patriarch lie, who is a high-priest of high-priests?' Kyr Macarius also of Antioch lifted up his voice, and said: 'Ye all know, O ye bishops and boyars, that in time past the emperors of the Romans convoked the most sacred synods. And *so* the most excellent *emperor Alexis Michaelovich,* no less than the autocrats of old, *has assembled this most religious synod:* and we too, having been invited [to it by him], have come hither, after suffering no end of hardships in accomplishing the long and difficult journey. Let this all-complete sovereign (παντάναξ) be witness before all that *he* has *laid the whole weight of the Church of the Russians on our shoulders,*

saying, "Behold the great judgment (κρίμα) of this Church: the Most High shall require it of your *necks* in the fearful day of judgment. *See, then, that ye do nothing of partiality* or passion." Say now, therefore, and answer, *we adjure thee by the truth itself*, O *brother* Nicon, and without any evasion (since also the law condemns no man unless it first hear from him and know what he hath done, *as we have it in the gospel* of St. John),[29] say, for what cause didst thou abdicate thy chair? For angels take down thy confession: God is not mocked: and if thou liest, thou wilt lie not unto men, but directly against the Spirit of truth Himself, who searcheth the reins and the heart.' Nicon replied: 'On account of the very great anger of the emperor.' And the emperor *all but sarcastically* said against this: 'All that thou sayest now, O father, thou hast learned from them that pretend to foretell things future by astrology.[30] These told thee, when thou wast still patriarch, and predicted, that after being six years patriarch thou shouldest be tyrannically dealt with by the emperor, that is, by me. But such predictions have been shown to be folly and nonsense: for it was not through any anger or hatred of mine that thou hast deserted thy chair, leaving for nine whole years the Church in widowhood: it was only of thine own self-will that thou didst what thou didst; *of thine own vain counsels*[31] *which were locked in thine own breast;* for thine own tortuous and multifarious desires, changing backwards and forwards *oftener than the Euripus*,[32] and going through more transformations *than the octopod*.'

The patriarchs resumed: 'And why, then, didst thou not add this on that dark day of thine abdication, "I quit my chair on account of the wrath of the emperor and the asperity of his conduct," but didst only declare that thou wert unworthy of the pastoral dignity, and together with the word didst also execute the deed, putting off the patriarchal robes, and saying aloud publicly [in the act of putting off each vestment], "I am unworthy," and, "I am no longer patriarch"?' Nicon *absolutely*

[29] Quoted against the murderous and hypocritical Jews by one of themselves in the case of Christ.

[30] Paisius himself seems to have been employed in this way by some of *his* friends at Moscow.

[31] That is, in the hope of bringing me round to reconsider the course I was taking, and to reverse my policy; in one word, to 'repent.'

[32] Here we have Paisius again, and Paisius alone manifestly.

denied having done this. Wherefore also, to prove the fact of his abdication, there were sought out credible witnesses; and there were put forward two bishops, Pitirim metropolitan of Novgorod and Joasaph of Tver, and some others, members of the synclete, especially the boyar Herodion [Streshneff], who was sent to request Nicon to return to his church; but he, notwithstanding that, refused, and even imprecated a curse on himself if he should ever return to the patriarchal chair. But Nicon persisted [in his denial of these facts], and called them all false witnesses, and such as gave their testimony in order to please men, to do the emperor [what they thought would be] the greatest service and pleasure. This imputation troubled them all not a little; and threw them into a very great excitement. 'Yes,' said the synod; 'but *the voice of the people* is the voice of God. And if in the mouth of two or three witnesses every word shall be established, it is not possible to say, when ten thousand persons of rank and worth witness against thee, that they all lie.' There was brought in therefore the book of Michael Attaliata, who writes, in title xvi. 'Of Witnesses,' these words: 'The witnesses must be credible persons; wherefore also are disqualified first the poor, as being in want of money; then all who are of bad repute, or in the pay of others: nor can slaves be witnesses against their masters; nor common informers; nor such as fight with beasts in the shows; nor heretics against orthodox Christians; nor Jews. There are excepted also bishops and priests, and protospatharii, and all who hold any of the greater dignities, who are not to be forced to give evidence against their will, but [are to be admitted to give it] only of their own will. And if they give their evidence voluntarily [and are so pleased, they may give it] not by appearing publicly in person, but in their own [houses or] apartments, as Psellus adds in his gloss.'. . . . Which having been read, it was said: 'Behold two bishops witness against thee, O Nicon, whose testimony is of the strongest and highest kind. And they give their evidence not in their cells, but personally present before us the two patriarchs, and the synod, and the synclete. And the civil law says: A witness is to be compelled either to bear witness of that which he knows, or to make oath that he knows not: else any poor and simple witness may be forcibly, as it were, dragged up to bear witness, to set forth the truth, and may be hauled about

from city to city to appear.' The synclete also cried out: '*Eyes, according to the Thurian saying*,[33] *are surer than ears.* What, then, we saw we bear witness of, and not what we only heard.' The patriarchs objected to Nicon: 'It cannot be; it is incredible that two or three should lie: or rather it is *not* incredible that *one* should lie, but that two or three witnesses should all lie is impossible.' 'Do ye, then,' said Nicon, 'believe my declared enemies, and those who are furious against me? No credence, no credence whatever is due to the wretch Pitirim, who even plotted to poison me. Let Pitirim be set aside; and then let this blasphemous act, this foul word, be proved against me by credible witnesses to the satisfaction of all.'

Order was made by the patriarchs to bring in the book of Matthew Blastar, and to read from it ch. iii. 'Of Witnesses,' as follows: 'The witnesses ought to be credible persons, not any low dirty persons, nor altogether insignificant: also their education and their employment should be considered, and so their testimony accepted, if they do not contradict one another. But if it appear that they are false witnesses, let them have their tongues cut out,' &c. Then of their being prejudiced for or against the accused, &c. &c. Then of the emperor, &c. &c.

But since, while this was going on, a vast hubbub had arisen among all, the patriarchs rose and said: 'It is not on this one charge only, my good man, that thou art accused, but there are also *ten thousand* other charges [in the indictment] against thee. Come then, come, let us turn to another of the accusations: Tell us how many bishops are required by the canons for the deposition of a bishop.' Nicon answered, 'Twelve.' The patriarchs said, 'Why then didst thou alone, of thyself, depose Paul bishop of Kolomna, and banish him; through which severity being driven to despair, he went out of his mind *and died?*' Nicon replied, 'I did not by my own authority *deprive* him *altogether*, but only stripped him of his mandya by way of giving him a lesson. But if he perished afterwards, that is not my fault, nor any matter of blame against me, but it concerns himself only.' And the bishops cried out at this: '*Thou alone didst deprive our brother* without our cognisance. Yet canon xii. of the synod of Carthage enacts that "one who has fallen under any accusation," &c.: on which account Kyr Luke patriarch of

[33] Again the synclete is Paisius.

C.P. disallowed the deposition made by John archbishop of Cyprus of the bishop of Amathus, &c. This Nicon in like manner by himself alone deposed Paul bishop of Kolomna: and after that condemnation, already so grave and painful, he added yet farther ignominy, by ordering him to be beaten every day unmercifully, not considering the prophetic word of Nahum, "Thou shalt not punish twice for the same offence:" and hence that wretched man, being driven out of his mind, and wandering about, perished no one knows by what death. Wherefore this great sin hangs to thy neck, O Nicon, for acting tyrannically against that Paul, whom thou didst shut up in the monastery. Thou pretendest to have been *exactly-just* (ἀκροδίκαιος) towards thy brother and fellow-minister. "Be not over *exactly-just* (ἀκροδίκαιος)," counsels somewhere the wise Solomon: and *the philosopher Pythagoras says*,[31] "Excesses are baneful: do nothing in excess: moderation in everything is best:" a golden apophthegm. And James the brother of God says, "For the judgment shall be without mercy to him that showed not mercy." And "with what measure ye mete it shall be measured to you again, not only in the world to come, but also in this present life," said He who is the truth itself. Through which oracles is established the principle of inflicting the same punishment as the offence. "Put up," said Jesus, who is God and man, to Peter, "thy sword into its sheath; for all they that take the sword shall perish by the sword." But if Nicon even caused to be scourged his own spiritual father Leonidas, and so exceedingly dishonoured him, what other sentence must he hear but this, that he is accursed, and is to be only short-lived on the earth?'

The most holy patriarchs, seeing that the strife of words was being protracted without end, said, 'We have not come here *to wrangle with thee* and to contend, but to pronounce the decision of the most holy patriarchs. And *since thou* in the former meeting *didst desire to learn if we had the authorisation of the other two patriarchs also, see here we show thee their signatures, written in these two tomes which were already sent* [*to Moscow*] *previously to our arrival.*' When Nicon saw these, he was silent; and in

[31] So the tsar, the boyars, the bishops, each of the two patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch, and the synod itself, all speak in the style of Paisius Ligarides, and quote the Greek Classics.

spite of himself, not being able to oppose the truth, he held his tongue.[35]

After this the heads of the patriarchal tomes were read out in Greek by Cosmas bishop of Amasia, and in Russ by Hilarion archbishop of Riazan. And first there was read ch. xiv., in which it is laid down that the bishop who has once abdicated his own chair and gone into retirement cannot afterwards return to it, nor he who has put himself down to the place of penitents. And in confirmation there was adduced canon xiii. of the First and Second council, held in the church of St. Sophia.

Nicon demurred to this canon, calling it spurious: for he recognised only the seven œcumenical councils, and only those local synods which had been held before [the last of] those same seven œcumenical councils; but those held subsequently he by no means received; and consequently he did not accept this First and Second synod as canonical and genuine. The patriarchs said: 'Probably, then, thou declinest also to accept as canonical this synod of ours, which has been *confirmed and* held against thee by the *four*[36] patriarchs?' Nicon answered: 'All these writings[37] are no better than old wives' stories, for there are adduced here spurious canons, most vilely understood and commented upon. Therefore I by no means receive them. For who has said that penitence is a plough? and who has applied that text of the gospel, "No man having once put his hand to the plough, &c." to the place of penance?'

The synod cried out, 'What then? Cannot the four patriarchs interpret the divine scripture and apply its texts, twisting and turning them to some salutary and edifying sense, when

[35] According to what Paisius has told us above, the *contents* of those tomes, subscribed by all the four patriarchs, were intended to be such as to answer the purpose of those who had obtained them, even without any farther process: else the exhibition now of those two signatures of *Dionysius* and Nectarius as attached to the tomes went no farther towards making the patriarchs *Parthenius* and Nectarius parties to the present synod or assembly at Moscow, than if the patriarchs Paisius and Macarius had taken out of their pockets two old letters with the same signatures, and had shown them to Nicon. Perhaps they did not really do exactly what Paisius makes them do, but merely indicated the agreement of all the four patriarchs who had subscribed and sent the tomes as a sufficient basis and warrant for anything which the two patriarchs personally present might do now; and this seems to be confirmed by what follows in Paisius' own narrative.

[36] *Confirmed* by all the *four*, *first*, and *held* only by us *two*, *afterwards*.

[37] Meaning the tomes sent by the four patriarchs.

every bishop at his ordination is appointed to be a teacher of the divine scripture? wherefore also he wears on his mandya the stripes like streams (ποταμοὺς) and like draughts (πόματα), to signify the voices of divinely-inspired doctrines and of their spiritual interpretation.'

The patriarchs therefore hereupon spoke themselves, and said words to this effect: 'We all, the four patriarchs, are successors of the holy apostles, and what we do and say we do and say in the name of the blessed apostles.' 'And farther,' added the patriarch of Antioch, 'I am the successor of the prince of the apostles Peter; this, my brother of Alexandria, is the legitimate successor of the evangelist Mark; the patriarch of C.P. is the successor of Andrew; and the patriarch of Jerusalem is the successor of James the brother of God. So then, if we say anything, we say it out of the mouths of the holy apostles and evangelists.' Nicon spoke against this, urging that they were not in possession of their ancient chairs, inasmuch as the patriarch of Alexandria has not his chair in Alexandria, but only lives in Egypt, and the patriarch of Antioch has not his chair in the city of Antioch, but lives in Damascus. Then the patriarchs cried out, 'We do not deny that our patriarchal residences have been removed, and that the original ones have been entirely laid waste, having been taken in war by the barbarians of those parts. Nevertheless we have not on that account lost [our title, so as to have ceased] to be true patriarchs: at least we had not when our predecessors the most holy Kyr Meletius of Alexandria and Kyr Joachim of Antioch dwelt in the very same places in which we now dwell. And them ye yourselves honour and reverence (in which ye do well), as having been catholic and legitimate patriarchs. Wherefore we also are to be accounted to be such as we are in truth, that is, legitimate. But if you do not regard us as legitimate on this single ground[38] that we have been forced to remove our residence, then neither should they who were patriarchs before us be regarded as legitimate, as many, that is, as lived in the same transferred patriarchal residences as we live in now. It

[38] But if Nicon had forfeited his title by removing his residence only to Voskresensk, which was in his own see or eparchy of Moscow, how much more had they become patriarchs ἐπὶ ψιλῷ ὀνόματι μόνον, *i. e.* merely titular patriarchs, who lived not even within the limits of their nominal sees? So they had better look at home before they countenanced his enemies in the use of such an argument as this. This no doubt was all Nicon meant. See his *Replies*, p. 97, &c.

follows also that those who have been or who are named patriarchs among yourselves have never had any share in the patriarchal power, as forsooth having received their ordination from us who were not legitimate patriarchs, and as having been invested with the title of patriarchs by patriarchs who had already removed from their original sees before our time, that is, by Jeremiah of C.P. and Sophronius[39] of Jerusalem, who, with the consent of the other patriarchs, decreed and indeed personally appointed Job to be patriarch of Moscow; and he was numbered with the rest of the patriarchs, being reckoned to be fifth. We, then, now equally are legitimate patriarchs, and as such shall be received and honoured by all men of sense and true Christians.'

But, indeed, against such contumacy of Nicon the emperor with the synclete and the synod objected, and said that he had uttered those words in a most malicious and reprobate (ἄδοκιμον) spirit, and had spoken foolishly and improperly.

Then Kyr Macarius of Antioch questioned Nicon, saying: 'Thou, O Nicon, wast not used in time past to have the sign of the cross in silver carried before thee: whence then hast thou now learned to have this brought in before thee, inconsiderately?' Nicon replied that 'the sign of the venerable cross is the standard of all Christians, and our weapon of victory, which routs and puts to flight all enemies visible and invisible.' 'Yes,' said the patriarch; 'but if in the time when thou wast patriarch this was not customary, how hast thou dared now to lift up this standard, when thou comest [only] to trial [and judgment], and after the abdication completed by thee with so much emphasis and solemnity?' Nicon answered nothing, but, *as being justly confuted*, held his tongue.

Then therefore, then, both the patriarchs gave order that the cross should be taken away from him. And thereupon Anastasius the archdeacon of the patriarch of Alexandria, having first made his reverence,[40] went up and took away the cross out of the hands of Nicon's deacon, and *held it before the two patriarchs* to the end [of the session], preceding them also with it as far as to the door of the new patriarchal palace.

After these things the patriarchs asked Nicon why he wore

[39] See *Replies of Nicon*, pp. 15, 53, 232, and 658.

[40] *i.e.* to the two patriarchs, which the Greek clergy call taking ἄδειαν, or permission.

on his breast two pectorals (ἐγκόλπια), and on his head a cap (καμελαύχιον) with seraphim worked in pearls on it, which was not customary? He replied, 'I have hung on my breast two pectorals because when I left Moscow I retained one as a *tutelary* (φυλακτήριον, to keep and protect me), and the other I have now added as a defensive weapon, fortifying myself with the cross, and *perhaps also anticipating that the cross might be taken away from me, as it has been*, by you, contrary to all *reasonable* expectation.'

When all this had passed, the patriarch of Alexandria rose and said: 'I ask you whether any of those who are here present are ignorant that the most holy patriarch of Alexandria is the œcumenical judge [or, as here it must be translated, the *judge of the universe*]?' They all cried out with one voice: 'We know and confess *that he is really*, as he is styled, the judge of all the universe.'

The patriarch of Alexandria lifted up his voice and said, 'Though I am the judge, I wish nevertheless to judge this man here out of the Nomocanon. Bring me hither the book of laws [τὸ Νόμιον, meaning the Πηδάλιον, Kormchay or Nomocanon]; and let canon xii. of the synod of Antioch be read, which runs thus: 'Whosoever *troubles the emperor and disturbs his empire is altogether without defence*,' &c.

Nicon, having his mind confused, cried out, objecting that this book was heretical, because it was printed by the heretics [the Latins, at Venice], and bore their seal [and imprimatur], and consequently had no authority.[11] On this account the [Greek] bishops present were called, and asked their opinion about the books printed elsewhere [*i.e.* in the west of Europe], and especially at Venice. And they all together answered: 'We get our Gospels, our Menæa, and our other church books from the renowned and powerful republic of Venice. And we, as we have no printing-presses of our own, and as these books contain nothing but the Greek order of service, accept these books, and honour them with all our souls, and cease not to read them in the church night and day.' There was brought forward for greater confirmation the Kormchay (Νόμιμον) of the Russians;

[11] As if he had objected: 'At least read your canons from some book written or printed among ourselves. Who can tell how far the Latin *imprimatur* at Venice goes towards authenticating a Greek Nomocanon or Πηδάλιον?'

But even this itself was objected to by Nicon, *as having been inaccurately printed in the time of the late patriarch Joseph.* Nicon was forced *to confess that some things had been ill and inaccurately printed even in the time of his own patriarchate; wherefore he had given a command to the bishops to correct them all with exactness, whenever there should be a convenient season.*

Afterwards the Roman [that is, the Greek] bishops were called, and were asked: What punishment then ought to be inflicted on Nicon, who had *trampled under foot the divine canons*, and *contemned the traditions of the fathers;* who had so many heavy *charges* against him, and was *implicated in so many murders*, and had accustomed himself to innumerable *acts of rapine* and *injustice* during *all* the time of his patriarchate? They said that 'he ought to be punished with ecclesiastical penalties: and since among these penalties the first and chiefest is deposition,[13] *let him be canonically deposed*, and stripped of all power to do sacerdotal acts.'

'Ye have spoken well,' said the most holy patriarchs: 'but still let the Russian bishops also be asked, and let them declare their opinions.' They all answered, 'Let him be deposed in the most complete manner: for he is not guilty on one charge only, but on many he is found plainly to have incurred the condemnation of truth.'

The patriarch of Antioch said: 'Sometimes *even the devil* has been found to speak truth, as when he cried with a loud voice, "What have I to do with thee, Jesus, thou son of the most high God? I adjure thee by God that thou torment me not." *But Nicon* has *never at any time so much as once spoken truth*, and has *shown himself worse than Satan*, hating *even more than does Satan* the perfect simplicity of the truth.'

The patriarch of Alexandria resumed: 'Behold, O Nicon, a time of penitence is now opened before thee. Bewail thy many sins, that thou mayest become fit for the kingdom of God, according to the holy gospel. For penance is in truth a spiritual plough. Wherefore it is well, says Theophylact, as soon as one has said what is good, without any evasion to act upon the same immediately.'

[13] *i. e.* here degradation: his deposition from the patriarchate, they pretended, was complete already; but they were not content with merely affirming this to be so, nor thought themselves safe unless he were altogether incapacitated from doing episcopal or even sacerdotal acts.

They cried out, in affirmation [of the same]: 'In truth a most necessary and useful thing is penance, which changes the mind through utterance, and manifests the inward evil thoughts through confession. We ought not, then, any longer to delay; but that which must be done, let it be done as quickly as possible.'

Then both the patriarchs stood up; and the patriarch of Alexandria, as the judge of the universe, from one end of the world to the other end of the antipodes, opened his mouth and delivered the following sentence:

'Blessed be God, who is glorified in Trinity, the Father the unbegotten, the Son who is begotten, and the Holy Ghost the Paraclete who proceedeth from the Father. It has seemed good then *to us, and to the Holy Ghost, and to the divinely-crowned emperor*, according to the power and grace given *to us*[43] from the life-giving and sacramentally-working Spirit, to bind and to loose whatever needs binding and loosing; and we decide, *according to the decision* of the most holy patriarchs our *brethren*[44] in the Holy Ghost and fellow-ministers, that Nicon is no more, nor is to be called any more in time to come, patriarch of Moscow, in consideration of the charges which have now been examined, and on account of all the offences lawlessly committed by him, offences altogether forbidden by the piety of the divine canons and subjected to penalties. And of these many charges the chief and most important are as follows: That he described the most excellent and most orthodox emperor as an *apostate* and a tyrant in his letters which he sent to the four patriarchs; that he declared that the whole of the most splendid synclete *latinised*, and had run on the rocks of heretical doctrines, without bringing any proof whatever of this, but so speaking merely from passion, and slandering his own flock; that he called the patriarchal tomes with their interpretations and answers a tissue of nonsense and old wives' fables; that he contemned the books printed *elsewhere* [*i. e. at Venice*], and even those printed at Moscow itself, and approved and used in the church, and called them *altogether* spurious, and even rejected [some of] the local

[43] And to *him?*

[44] So putting off the present decision upon the patriarchal tomes, and *specially* upon *those* two patriarchs, or *ex*-patriarchs, who have nothing to do with the present decision.

synods, saying that *they* contained nothing at all sound nor canonical, but introduced empty-sounding canons and absurd misinterpretations; that he insulted the patriarchs, and said they were not legitimate on account of the transfer of their chairs, and instead of them presumed to commemorate others, without having inquired into and ascertained the truth; that he had shown himself a slayer of his brethren, inasmuch as he alone, of himself, deposed Paul the bishop of Kolomna, and caused the same bishop to be also cruelly scourged, not considering the divine oracle to be found in Nahum, "Thou shalt not punish twice for the same offence;" that by his own voluntary act and determination he stripped himself of the patriarchal robes, calling himself altogether unworthy, within the great patriarchal church: and, to sum up all at once, on account of this man's acts of rapine and injustice and lawlessness, and on account of his *fantastical ideas*,[45] we strip him of all episcopal honour and power, so that for the future he is no longer to be called patriarch or bishop, nor to wear any episcopal ornaments, but he shall be, and shall be called by all, simply "the monk."[46] Thus let him be styled, and thus let him be, for all time to come, and once for all.'

Order was made that this sentence and act of deposition should be written in the Roman [*i.e.* in the Romaic or Greek] and Russian languages, for a perpetual record. And it was determined that on a set day there should be performed *in presence of the Church*, according to the ancient order and usage, the act of deposition. And so all the synod hastened to separate; and every one returned to his own lodgings, wondering at the *obduracy of Nicon's heart*, and at his unchanging and unrepenting *madness*.

But first Nicon said aloud, looking at the patriarchs: 'Ye have power *now* to say and to do such things because ye have received authorisation (ἐνδόσιμον) from *the emperor* Alexis Michaelovich, who, honouring you not according to your deserts, has given you these exalted seats.'[47]

'What then?' said the patriarch of Alexandria; 'am I the first or the only patriarch whom the autocrat Kyr Alexis Mi-

[45] Respecting the relations of the ecclesiastical and the civil authorities?

[46] γέροντας or starets, which is literally an 'elder;' but these words in Greek and Slavonic are used in a secondary sense of monks: so Nicon's degradation from the *priesthood* also is *implied*.

[47] He probably added something more, though Paisius has omitted it.

chaelovich has invited hither and honoured? or have there not been other patriarchs before me, whom the most serene emperors of religious memory have honoured? Did not Basil Porphyrogenitus crown with his own diadem Theophilus, patriarch of Alexandria, after his judgment?' 'Yes,' said the patriarch of Antioch; 'and the renowned emperor Basil Bulgaroctonos, after he had delivered Antioch from the tyranny of the barbarians, and restored it to the Roman empire, honoured the then patriarch Agapius with a chrysobulla, and gave him the monastery of the Hodigitria,[48] which possessed immense revenues, for his maintenance. Why, then, does it seem strange to thee that we should sit as judges on thrones? But was it fit for thee, when *in the act of being condemned* by so many bishops, and burdened with so many and grave charges, to sit upon a lofty throne, *while we*, who had been called in to be thy judges, *should stand*, justifying ourselves against thy many accusations?'

Nicon replied: 'No doubt Theophilus also *sat* to condemn St. John Chrysostom.'

The synod replied: 'Art thou, then, blameless like Chrysostom? who was slanderously accused of being an Origenist when he was really unspotted, and more pure than gold; and on his account all the people of Christ were shedding hot tears; and the ambon of the great church was consumed by fire from heaven. But for thee all weep and lament as for an evil-doer, as for a man most notorious for rapine and covetousness. But now hold thy tongue, and go to thy cell, neither whispering anything [to others] nor muttering secretly [to thyself].'

But he, shrugging[49] his shoulders, or affecting to tremble, said even to the common people these words: 'Thou altogether deservest, O Nicon, to suffer what thou sufferest for thy love of truth. Thou oughtest not to have been so plain-spoken in uttering truth, but shouldest have dissembled it, and sometimes disguised it with words of economy (*προσθέτους*), suiting thyself to times and occasions.' With such foolish and insane words on his lips did he step into his carriage (his sledge), and went home.

[48] *i.e.* of our Lady, or her icon, known by the title 'Οδηγήτρια at C.P.

[49] *ὑποτρέμων*: though perhaps Paisius means to give quite another sense to Nicon's irony, which is reported also by Shusherin, and which was not addressed to the people, but was muttered to himself and to his own clerks, and that at another time.

CHAP. XVI. *How Nicon was definitively deposed [degraded] by sentence of the Synod in its third act.*

On the 12th of December there was held the third meeting in the new patriarchal palace, when, all the bishops having come together there, and the boyars of the most glorious (ἐνδοξοτάτης) synclete being present on behalf of the emperor's majesty, Nicon was ordered to appear before the most sacred synod. And when he had come to the place in which they were assembled, he was amazed to see the bishops all standing vested with their epitrachelia and omophoria in the neighbouring church[50] of the Annunciation. And the patriarchs having said the Εὐλογητὸς κ.τ.λ., and having performed the rest of the office, there was read aloud by the priest John, economus of the church of Antioch, the copy of the deposition, running thus:

'In the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, Amen. Whereas Nicon, heretofore patriarch of Moscow, *has troubled our* long-reigning *emperor* Kyr Kyr Alexis Michaelovich, &c., &c., and has *disturbed all his* orthodox *empire*, and *has interfered in affairs not belonging to the patriarchal power and office*, the heads of which our divinely-crowned emperor sent and notified to *us* the *four* œcumenical patriarchs, asking whether it seemed to them proper and reasonable that any patriarch should so act, and above all inquiring with respect to the extraordinary act done in the midst of the great church, when Nicon put off all his episcopal robes, crying out with a loud voice, "I am no longer patriarch, nor do I any longer consider myself a shepherd but a sheep, as being unworthy and a sinner;" and after having thus done and spoken, with great wrath and impetuosity, he went away, and flung off his patriarchal dignity, and of his own will resigned the flock committed to him, without any violence or compulsion, hurried on only by human passion, and out of revenge against a certain boyar of the synclete, who had struck his patriarchal servant and driven him away from the imperial banquet-hall, as being only a layman: wherefore also he feigned to go away in humble guise to do penance, yea, and to be in quiet, and to weep for his own sins, in the monastery which he

[50] In a small chapel over the entrance into the Choudoff monastery, close to the gate of the Kremlin; not in the patriarchal palace, but in that patriarchal monastery to which they went from 'the new patriarchate.'

had founded. Nevertheless, while he was there also he continued to do episcopal acts, ordaining freely, and consecrating, and dedicating [chapels], building new monasteries with unseemly titles and empty names, as New Jerusalem, Golgotha, Bethlehem, and Jordan, trifling with divine things, mocking holy things, styling himself patriarch of the New Jerusalem, plundering like a robber (and if he had had the power, he would have appropriated even the third part of the empire). And though he had definitively given up his chair, he would not suffer that another patriarch should be created, acting with hypocrisy. Therefore, when they had knowledge of such his deceitfulness, when our most serene monarch and the most sacred bishops and all the most splendid senate knew of such his great dishonesty, and his intrigues, and his villany, his audacity and self-will, his sacrilege and his greediness, they did not venture to elect another patriarch to the chair of Moscow, lest there should be at once two patriarchs, one outside and the other within the city, with a divided jurisdiction: For this cause also our most excellent emperor wished that the œcumenical patriarchs should come bodily and personally to Moscow, and make there an exact investigation:—We then find the aforesaid Nicon guilty personally, or by complicity, of many and divers charges. Among other charges there was one that he anathematised the bishops of his own country, without any sentence or trial, on the first Sunday in Lent, called the Sunday of Orthodoxy, and with sarcastic buffoonery called two of the bishops Annas and Caiaphas; and two members of the synclete, who were sent to him as commissioners from the emperor, he called Herod and Pilate. Therefore Nicon was summoned, according to the usual order, to come and make true answer and apology as to those charges which were brought against him. But Nicon not only did not come in humble guise, as we had *in brotherly love* prescribed to him, *to obtain for him more sympathy*, but he at once began and ceased not *to condemn us*, saying that we were not in possession of our own ancient chairs, but lived elsewhere as strangers, and wandered about, the one of us having his chair in Egypt, the other at Damascus. Farther he called our patriarchal decisions "trash" and "fables;" and when we adduced, with reference to the charges brought against him, canons opposed to his practices, he called them supposititious and spurious, especially canon ii. of

the synod held in St. Sophia, which enacts nearly in these words: "The bishop who has gone to the place of penitents is no longer to meddle with what belongs to the episcopate." This canon he altogether rejected, and set aside all the canons of the local and particular synods. And yet in the ordinal (τακτικῷ) of bishops we find that he who is to be consecrated a bishop is to make a confession that he receives all the written ecclesiastical tradition, both the œcumenical and the particular and local synods; yea, and the sacred synods held at C.P. in the church of St. Sophia and in the palace against Barlaam of Calabria and Acridenus and their followers, which sincerely confirmed the Seventh œcumenical synod. Moreover those expositions and interpretations which we jointly drew out and propounded as bishops and teachers of the Church of Christ he called "nonsense." For the greater confirmation, then, of our propositions, and the more abundant certainty of the conclusions arrived at, we brought forward the canons of the Eastern Nomocanon,[51] which is called the Basilicon. But even this, with the utmost impudence, he roundly declared to be heretical, because it had been printed *elsewhere*, that is, in the western parts. Also in the *letters written by him to us* the four œcumenical patriarchs, which *fell into the hands* of the most serene emperor, he described this *our* most Christian monocrat Kyr Kyr Alexis Michaelovich as a *latiniser*,[52] a tyrant, a Jeroboam, *who was wronging the Church*, and an Uzziah; and he wrote that the synclete in like manner and all the Russian Church had miserably run upon the rocks of Latin doctrines. And this he said chiefly on account of the metropolitan of Gaza Paisius, being moved by spite against him, because he knew that he was in the habit of conferring with the most splendid *synclete* respecting *certain political affairs*. Verily he who dishonours the flock committed to him is not a shepherd, but shall rightly be considered and plainly called a hireling, as not laying down his life for the sheep. Moreover of himself alone he deposed a bishop, without any local synod or meeting in which he should have made clear the charge against him. For we know that the œcumenical patriarch [the patriarch, that is, of C.P.] did not allow the deposition decreed by John archbishop of Cyprus against the bishop of Amathus, though made by eleven bishops,

[51] *i.e.* of the modern Greek Πηδάλιον. Νόμιμον, the 'book of laws,' is the word in the original.

[52] See *Replies*, &c. p. xxi. and 670.

for this single reason that the requisite number of twelve had not been completed, but there had been one short of it. And, after the deposition of Paul bishop of Kolomna, whom he also savagely stripped of his mandya, he inflicted on him stripes and most severe disciplines, forgetting that text which forbids us to punish twice for one and the same offence. Wherefore also the result was that the said bishop went out of his mind, and perished miserably, no man knowing whether he was destroyed by some wild beast, or fell into the river and was drowned. Farther, he even ordered his own spiritual father [his confessor] to be unmercifully beaten and scourged during two years, so that he became altogether paralytic, as we have ourselves seen with our own eyes. Since, then, we have ascertained that Nicon did not behave himself like a bishop nor with gentleness, but tyrannically, allowing himself habitually in acts of injustice and *rapine*, and behaving himself like a tyrant, we have, in accordance with the divine and sacred canons of the apostles and of the œcumenical and particular and local councils, excluded him from every sacerdotal function, so that he may be no longer capable of pretending to do any episcopal act; and we have altogether degraded him with omophorion and epitrachelion, in conjunction with all the local and most sacred synod, decreeing that from henceforth he is to be considered and to be called simply the monk Nicon, and no longer patriarch of Moscow. And for the place of his abode, to his last breath, *it has been appointed* that this shall be a certain ancient and easily accessible (εὐπρόσοδον) monastery, that there he may be able to *bewail his sins in great quietness*. And it *has farther been appointed* that one archimandrite of good reputation shall be with him to keep guard over him perpetually, *that no one may dare of his own will to insult him* or *to commit any sudden violence against him*; and that Nicon himself, on the other hand, *may not be able for the future to concoct any plots* or wily stratagems. And, besides this, *it has been ordered* that there shall be with him some honourable man from the imperial court with a small detachment of soldiers to keep guard for the complete custody and safe-keeping of Nicon, that no letters may be carried to him or from him [as would else be easy] to disturb the peace and trouble the state of the Russians. All these things *we* have *canonically* done, acting without *any respect of persons* or passion

in condemning, fearing the incorruptible eye of God (*for God has an eye to execute vengeance*), and fearing that future tribunal which shall recompense the same punishment [to them that have wronged others]: and revolving in our mind and thought the fearful threatenings of punishment *in this present life*, and in the world to come of everlasting fire, we have decreed and published a righteous and godly judgment, according to the gift given us from above, from the unbegotten Father, the begotten Son, and the Holy Ghost, the one and tri-personal Trinity: and according to the power given from the apostles, and continued by succession even to us, we declare Nicon, heretofore patriarch of Moscow, to be stripped of all power to do any episcopal act, so that from this present day he is no longer to be called a patriarch, but simply Nicon the monk. And whosoever hereafter shall dare to call him still patriarch, he shall incur the penalties of the holy fathers. Read in the year from the foundation of the world 7175, but from the Incarnation 1666, Dec. 12.'

This same act was read aloud in Slavonic also by Hilarion archbishop of Riazan; and at times Nicon muttered something while it was being read, as if to show that he was not willing so much as to listen to it. Wherefore also he often murmured his objections, and denying [this or that], reviled [the authors of that document] in return. However, his contradiction was all to the air, and he only justified his name Neicon by his *contentiousness*. And he continued gainsaying to no purpose, pouring out weak washy nonsense, like the earthen mugs of water-drinkers at a fountain.[52]

Then the patriarchs, standing in the middle of that holy chapel, declared his perfect degradation in the usual form, saying both of them that he must also be stripped of the customary insignia of the episcopate, viz. of the pectoral (ἐγκόλπιον) and of the mandya. But *none dared to take them from him*, from some reverence to the highest rank of the priesthood. At length, therefore, the patriarch of Alexandria, *approaching him gently and quietly*, took off the cap (καμηλαύχιον) from the head of Nicon. And Nicon said, '*Take also my mandya, if thou wilt;* for *now* thou hast the power.' 'Well, we ought indeed to do so,' said the patriarchs; 'but *in consideration of the urgent request and entreaty of our long-lived emperor Alexis*,[53] we allow thee to retain

[52] κρουσοχυτρολήραιος, a word of the comedian Aristophanes.

[53] That there may be less to strike the eye of *the people* outside.

the episcopal mandya which thou art wearing *until* thou be come to the monastery appointed for thy place of banishment; for then thou must be finally stripped of it, in token of thy being only a simple monk, and no longer a bishop.' So they left it on him, and also the pectoral,[54] which was set all over with pearls. But Nicon said sarcastically, 'I know that, as ye are poor, ye will be glad to have some pearls, so you had better take my pectoral.'[55] But the patriarchs answered him, 'Take back this, and keep it to thine own confounded perdition' (ἔχε τοῦτο λαβὼν εἰς τὴν σὴν ὀλεθρίαν ἀπώλειαν): 'for let not the oil of the sinner anoint my head, as David sings, prophesying, O Nicon, in that psalm, for thy case.'

So Nicon vacated the patriarchate; though, as he passed along, he said to the people: 'O truth, thou hast perished! falsehood prevails.' *In truth* thou *oughtest not*, O Nicon, to have been so free-spoken, nor to have represented *the truth* so plainly, so categorically, to the emperor and to the boyars, without being in any degree whatever abashed. For *if thou hadst behaved more politicly, flattering and humouring them*, thou wouldst not have come at last to such a condemnation,[56] O wretched man! Bear, then, now courageously what thou hast suffered, and be content. Else, as the philosopher Epictetus says, if thou frettest in vain, thou hurtest only thyself, and [the stream] that bears thee down bears thee down [all the same].

The bishops[57] then were indignant at what had been said, and smarting under it (σφαδάζοντες), they were exceedingly annoyed about the pectoral. Wherefore they all desired that this same ornament might be taken back immediately. So *two of the boyars being sent*, as if from the *patriarchs*, regained it, stripping it off from him, and hanging it up in the great church *with triumph*, where the patriarchs also *gave up*[58] *of their own accord* the cross of silver gilt, as if shaking off from themselves *all imputation* of covetousness.

[54] Commonly called the Panagia, though it is not always nor necessarily an icon of our Lady.

[55] But compare Shusherin's account of the same incident.

[56] This apostrophe here curiously appropriated by Paisius is *thus far* not an unfair representation of Nicon's own words, really a repetition of some former advice given him by the tsar, as if spoken by himself to himself. See note p. 190.

[57] The *Greek* bishops more especially?

[58] To *whom* were these things virtually given up? and *who* was it that triumphed?

Chap. XVII. *Recapitulation of the troubles which had come upon the Church.*

In the morning the bishops met in the new patriarchal palace, as if to hear some communication from the two patriarchs. And when the bishops were all seated in order in the synodicon, there appeared before them Leonidas, formerly Nicon's confessor, who had now become paralytic, having scars of wounds on his knees, having been bound with heavy chains, scourged, and cruelly treated during two years by the ex-patriarch Nicon, having been confined in a dark prison, worn out with hunger and thirst: and he related, with expressions to move compassion, the details of his sufferings; how, and for what cause, he, poor wretch, had incurred so many and so severe sufferings. We were all utterly astounded at what had been done, at what we heard related; and we could not listen without tears.

But the patriarchs began to speak as follows: 'Ye see, O brethren, plainly that Nicon was not a *convenient* labourer for the Lord's field and vineyard. *But* during the time of his absence very many poisonous roots of schisms, and thorny tares of heresies, have sprung up, to the damage of this Russian state, which we now ought to root out, [though it be] not without blood, attending diligently, labouring painfully for their perfect extirpation, and for the ejection of the error which has gone mad about material elements (ὑλομανησάσης). These scandals of the Church have greatly afflicted our most Christian emperor Kyr Kyr Alexis Michaelovich. For the harmony of the holy Church is broken; and the treasure of the ancient beautiful order is lost. . . . Justice is thrust out: now everywhere acts of rapacity abound: tyranny and ambition enriches itself; so that our heaven-defended emperor has of his humane regard referred all to us as inspectors and judges, that we should go to the sources [of these evils], and with sincerity set all in good order, after examination of each matter in detail, adding at last with a groan: "Ye are to be inspectors, and shepherds, and bishops of all; wherefore, going up to the upper chamber of your mind, look out and see how the wild beasts are seeking to invade the fold, to kill and slay the lambs." Therefore, having examined, we have found that the whole ecclesiastical state has been brought into thorough disorder, and has fallen to ruin, by unmistakable experience. Wherefore we have determined to set about restor-

ing it with all our soul; contending for the truth, reproducing by unction Aaron, by zeal Phinehas, by judgment Daniel and Solomon, seeking that which is lost, turning back to the pasture the sheep which has strayed, and restoring it to the company of the ninety-nine, observing when the times have need of economy and condescension. Nicon indeed, who was the cause of scandals, has been throughout the chief author of the calamities, the originator of the confusion. But now the spring-time so much needed has dawned; the sea has become calm; the sky is clear; the winds are lulled all around; since the mist of darkness has dispersed, the threatening clouds have evaporated, the halcyons have begun, &c. &c. Nicon has been cast out and stripped of all episcopal power, that worker of innumerable mischiefs, who had lifted up his head so high as to despise his own brethren, to his own destruction; and the peace of God from on high, which passeth all understanding, has entered into the recesses of our hearts, and filled our bowels, which were before cut as it were asunder. Ye have seen his madness, his haughtiness, his confidence. He never once said, "I erred as a man," but on every point wrangled and fought, *not coming to conversion, to repentance*, but always persisting in his own obstinacy he invented and put forward sophistries in defence of his sins,[59] contriving artifices, scheming, behaving with duplicity and dishonesty, and boiling with envy and malice against all, leaping upon all with disorderly violence, thrusting out his tongue fiercely even to heaven, having devised many improprieties against the good order of Christ's Church, emptily swelling, behaving like a child. In truth, for a man to correct himself is something angelic; but it is directly satanical, on the other hand, to be incapable of repentance. If Lucifer had ever said, "I have sinned; forgive me, O my Creator!" Lucifer would have been no longer Lucifer, as Chrysostom witnesses, but an archangel, and the prince, as before, of all the heavenly powers.'

On this the synod said: 'The creator and framer of the visible and invisible universe, who is one Lord in three persons, &c., who made the two great lights, the sun and the moon, &c. &c., and set them in the firmament, has also set you two patriarchs as two great lights in the firmament of the Church, you who are apostles with the Twelve for the preaching of the gospel.

[59] προφασιζόμενος προφάσεις ἐν ἁμαρτίαις, 'excusationes excusans in peccatis.'

For your sound is gone out into all lands, &c. Wherefore that is true which is said by John Euchaïta rhetorically of the Three Hierarchs: "Having received wisdom from God, as other three apostles of Christ, &c. &c., ye are the light of the world, the salt of the earth, the patriarchal heads, ever shining to give light on the earth," &c. &c. You the Sun of Justice has set aloft in this great house of the Church, to make glad this same Church, to illumine the Russian state. You the Most High has glorified in this council, as he glorified Alexander of Alexandria who presided in the council of Nice, and the patriarch of Antioch the generous Eustathius. May ye live for the longest term of life, for the benefit and help of the people of Christ, and may your reward be of the greatest in the kingdom of heaven, in the ever-flourishing amaranthine crown of your prizes, your decorations, your wreaths, to the enjoyment of which may both you and we attain, being made partakers with hymns and delights with the choir of the most holy patriarchs as citizens and inhabitants of the ever-blessed paradise. Yea, yea, all-holy Christ, our king. So be it! so be it!'

Book III.

This book has an introduction, entitled '*Preliminaries to the election and institution to the patriarchate of the new patriarch Kyr Joasaph.*' But it opens with an enumeration of all the *threes* in nature, man, the scriptures, and religion; and after nine pages, all about the number *three*, Paisius at length winds up thus: 'Here I will end my discourse of the *threes*, since it needs more time than can now be afforded. So we return to the web of our history, weaving the warp and twining the web [or going about the beam of the loom], taking up again the thread, and plying the shuttle full of wool' (*τὸν στήμονα ὑφαίνοντες, καὶ πλέκοντες τὸν ἱστὸν, τὴν κροκὴν ἐπαναλαβόντες, καὶ τὴν κερκίδα κινήσαντες τοῦ ἱρίου ἀνάπλεον*).

Chap. I. *How the two Patriarchs celebrated the liturgy in the great church.*

There was now at hand the festival of St. Peter, the first metropolitan of the capital of Moscow; and both the patriarchs

were invited to celebrate the liturgy. Two seats were set for them overnight, covered with silk, near the patriarchal place, opposite to the imperial throne, on which about [after] midnight they sat, and sang and finished all the vigil service (for they cautiously refrained from mounting the patriarchal chair, to avoid any sort of scandal). They ordered, however, that none of the bishops should wear a cross on their mitre. Some did not like this prohibition. But the bishops of White Russia, Lazarus and Methodius, who were most displeased, and objected that they had this privilege from the patriarch of C.P., were told that the concession was only within their own dioceses. However, those who had the sakkos were allowed to wear it. After the liturgy [in which the bishops concelebrated with the two patriarchs] the prayer of the κόλλυβα (which had not been in use before in the commemorations of the saints) was said by the patriarch of Alexandria; and after the dismissal (the ἀπόλυσις) the emperor feasted them in their apartments. And after the dinner there was a discussion about the prohibition of the crosses on the mitres, since some presbyters even are σταυροφόροι (*i. e.* have the privilege of wearing the cross): only a bishop, however, can wear crosses on the phenolion, and on his head, or wear an epigonation . . . also of the kollyba . . . and of the *colours* of these, representing the virtues and graces . . . [Then he gives the story of Theodore the great martyr appearing to the bishop Euzoïus in the city of the Euchaïtæ to turn away the people from eating what had been offered to idols, &c.; . . . also of the symbolism of the *Graces*, &c.]

CHAP. II. *How on the festival of Christ's nativity the Patriarchs came to the palace to sing the polychronion for the Emperor.*

And now it was the eve of the Nativity, when the hours were sung, according to the custom, in the new patriarchal palace. At the time for vespers both the patriarchs came, as being to celebrate the liturgy the next morning and sing the polychronion for the emperor. At night [*i.e.* in the vigil service, consisting on this occasion of the nocturn and matins, the vespers having been sung separately overnight], the right choir sang in Greek and the left in Slavonic, a thing which was new in Muscovy, and all were pleased at it, as showing the unity of the Church, divided only by difference of language. In the

morning, about the first hour of the day, all the bishops and all the members of the synclete came in in procession in files, &c. &c. And after the proclamation [of the polychronion] the patriarch of Alexandria pronounced the following encomium:

'If I call thee, O emperor of long life Alexis Michaelovich, a most pious autocrat, this most glorious title will suit thee with the strictest truth, since night and day thou meditatest what belongs to piety, what promotes orthodoxy, as an advanced champion, a vanguard warrior of the Catholic Church, a vigilant defender, an excellent leader in council, a valiant carer for ecclesiastical affairs, &c. &c. . . . Or again, if I call thee crowned of God; or if I call thee all-serene Augustus, and legitimate heir of the empire of the Palæologi, from which race as from some golden chain thou art descended, namely from the Palæologène Sophia, this title also is perfectly appropriate. Wherefore be strong, and be of good courage, to *regain* the throne which has long been due to thee, and which is *reserved for thee*. . . . Thou hast thyself already enlarged the bounds of the empire beyond what former emperors were able to do. . . All this for thy innate meekness, like that of David, and for thy inherent temperance and chastity. . . . Blessed in truth the womb that bore so great and so excellent a sovereign, and well [was thy mother] named Eudoxia.[1] In truth and not only in word was thy mother Augusta, and Lady Empress, through whom it pleased the gracious God that there should come to light the thrice-great *Alex*is and new *Alex*ander, monocrat, &c. &c., the succourer of the Orthodox, and after God their only anchor and *protection* and *help*. Constantine was once vouchsafed to see two patriarchs, Alexander of Alexandria and Eustathius of Antioch; but now God has vouchsafed to thee, our most excellent autocrat and new emperor Constantine, to see us their successors. May God then,' &c. &c. [ending with all the usual good wishes.]

After this we went down to the church; and, all wearing our robes, we awaited the coming of the emperor. And presently he came, wearing all his imperial robes, and all his synclete with him, also wearing state dresses of gold tissue. And after the liturgy we went up to the painted chamber, in which we banqueted, the emperor sitting on his silvered throne, and the

[1] And before this there is *a line of Homer* inserted; so this speech too, like the rest, is a lucubration of Paisius.

two patriarchs being near him, wearing new mandyas with the linings (*καὶ τὰς ἀμπεχομένας*) of Siberian furs commonly called sables (*σαμούρια*), sent on that same festival to them as presents or *sportulæ* from the emperor (*καντσχια ξένια*).

CHAP. III. *How the two Patriarchs came [in like manner to the palace] on the new year, and celebrated there the liturgy.*

It was the new year's day of this new year 1667 from the Incarnation; and the emperor Alexis Michaelovich thought that he ought to observe the Roman custom. Wherefore he sent for the two patriarchs privately, as if that they might give their blessing to the most religious lady the Augusta Maria, and her eldest son the hossoudar Alexis Alexievich, and the sisters and daughters of the emperor, with all his house. And the patriarch Paisius began, with a prayer, to speak to the most dear children of the emperor, having Dionysius the archimandrite of the Iversky monastery to interpret for him, as follows: 'O thrice-happy branches of the imperial root, on whose most worshipful twigs and abundant boughs the nations scattered afar shall rest and lodge together, and shall delight themselves in peace under your shade! For if of old the king Nebuchadnezzar, &c. &c. For on your empire the sun never sets; and we see it extending itself now to the west, now to the east. . . . And may the Lord grant of his goodness that those ancient prophecies, spoken of old from the beginning, may obtain their accomplishment through the yellow race of the Russians in your times, by your *recovering* that empire and monarchy to which you have an ancestral claim, so that you *alone* may have power and lordship both over the east and the west, over the north and the south, and the borders of your empire may be extended and widened on all sides. May the Most High be pleased to subject to your rightly-dividing feet all the barbarous nations scattered over many lands, and now unbelieving; that the people who sit in darkness (*I mean the Cimmerians, who for six whole months have no light*) may see the great light of the knowledge of God, &c. &c. Therefore, increase and be multiplied, in stature and in grace, O ye, who are our hopes for the safety and salvation of the universe, that all may recognise in your virtues and *prosperity* the golden trunk, the imperial root, which reproduces in you by successive generations its ancestral nobility,' &c. &c. [concluding in the usual style.]

Then the patriarch, turning to the empress, addressed her thus: 'Many daughters have wrought mighty things . . . but thou hast exceeded all, as we may now say with the wise Solomon, O most serene and most christian empress, Lady Augusta, Maria Ilichna, new blessed Helena, and *beauteous Pulcheria*. The Lord has chosen thee out of so many women to be more honourable than them all.' [And after speaking of the fame of her almsdeeds, and of her goodness to the clergy, of which they had heard everywhere, he continues:] 'Blessed in truth is thy womb, which has given us four princes, that we may bless and sanctify thee, that their empire may increase perpetually even to the very ends of the universe . . . Of a truth this good fecundity is everywhere considered a part of happiness, but especially in kingdoms [*i.e.* in royal families]; and in this case it gives us great hope that thou art to enrich all the world by thy four rivers, and establish solidly by these four elements the vast [that is, the œcumenical] empire, viz. by the most religious grand prince Alexis Alexievich, the most religious grand prince Theodore Alexievich, the most religious grand prince Simeon Alexievich, and the most religious grand prince John Alexievich, through whom we trust and are assured that our four patriarchates shall be established, being founded on the unshaken rock of the holy gospels of our Saviour Christ. Hear, O Lord God, the prayer which we offer from the depth of our hearts,' &c. &c.

After this the patriarch turned his address to the princesses, and said: 'Rejoice in the Lord! and again I say to you, rejoice! *for it is no small grace that he has given you to be blessed personally by us, the true successors of Peter and Mark, the patriarchs who, to use a bold figure, illumine and adorn the firmament of the Catholic Church*, after having been born of royal parents, &c. &c. We are come indeed in the first place, at the request, made through his letters, of our long-lived emperor, to root out all tares, and to put an end to those scandals of the Church which the sower of tares has sown in the field of the Lord. But we have come also to bless and to pray for and to sanctify you. And, behold now, lifting up both our hands with all our hearts, we do bless you and pray for you,'[2] &c. &c.

[The young prince] Alexis Alexievich would have replied to thank the patriarchs *in Greek;* but his father the emperor Alexis Michaelovich anticipated him, and asked the patriarchs thus *in*

[2] Thus the mocking serpent *blessed* that family to its *extinction*.

Greek: 'My wife the empress, and my imperial children, and the princesses my sisters, and my daughters ask how you could pass over such a long distance, and accomplish such a difficult journey; but they are delighted at your presence here, and desire to receive your prayer and your blessing, asking it with all their heart and soul.' This the emperor said; and they all showed their concurrence. The patriarch rejoiced to hear the emperor speak Greek, *even as that Persian* who put out his eyes for joy when he had seen Alexander in a Persian dress, or as the synod of the CCCXVIII. fathers when they heard Constantine speak Greek, and said nearly what his master said to Cicero when Cicero spoke Greek at Athens: 'We *had one* thing left us, and now you have taken that away too, O dear *Romans!* We rejoice nevertheless at being so despoiled, expecting the liberation of the Greek empire and its recovery by you powerful Russians, who now reign, and have inherited both the empire and the orthodoxy of the Romans.'

After a suitable reception and complimentary attentions they went to the church to celebrate the divine liturgy, with only a few bishops and archimandrites concelebrating, as the church of the palace was extremely small. And afterwards they went into the trapeza, where, however, there was only a slight repast. But they were not suffered to depart without receiving presents of honour from the emperor; for a silver jug and ewer was given to each of the patriarchs, and sent after them to their lodgings; and in addition 150 pairs of choice Siberian sables. And so ended the auspicious ceremonies of the new year.

CHAP. IV. *How the chronological reckoning of the years of the world from the creation to Christ was made a question by the Russian bishops.*

And now a much more intricate question than those which had preceded was started, as preliminary (*προαγωνία*, preliminary, that is, to the drawing up of the acts of the late synod), viz. to know whether our common reckoning is canonical, and does not err from the true number of years? For the most blessed patriarchs had written in the original of their manifesto that 'this present instrument is given in A.M. 7175 (*ψοε'*) or A.D. 1667'[3]

[3] We are now at January 1, A.D. 1667; else at the actual date of the document and in the document itself it should be, as it *is* above, 1666.

(ᾳχξζ'). It was immediately questioned by the Russian bishops whether this patriarchal epoch is right, and this chronological reckoning of time accurate. For these reckon differently, and make more years, and insist on their own reckoning of 5533 (ε,φλγ') years beginning [*i.e.* going back] from the resurrection, and from the birth of Christ, from which last event they say that there were 33 years to the resurrection, concluding for a certain metachronism; so that there are not from the birth of Christ 1667, but fewer years by 25, which reckoning of theirs is most plainly contrary to that of all other nations, which reckon not from the resurrection but from the nativity. 'This' [he says, quoting Socrates] 'is a most difficult subject, the Hebrews being at variance with the Greeks, and the Latins also. There are six genealogies or sequences of generations: 1. from Adam to Noah; 2. from Noah to Abraham; 3. from Abraham to David; 4. from David to the Captivity; 5. from the Captivity to the Return; and 6. from the Return to Christ: and the seventh period, commencing from Christ, is an image of the Sabbath of rest.'

Now according to Nicephorus Callistus and to Suidas there are from Adam to the Flood 222 [2220] years, thence to the Tower of Babel 525, thence to Abraham 425 (or from the Flood to Abraham 950); thence to the Exodus 430, thence to the Temple 757, thence to the Captivity 425, making all together 4080 [really by addition making 4782]; thence to the empire of Alexander 318, and thence to Christ 303 [330], making in all 5500, according to old tradition.[3] But we make 5508; and it is difficult to say whence we and the Greeks have got the additional 8 years.

Petavius seeks to solve the difficulty thus: He takes occasion from Theophanes [the continuator of Syncellus], the historian Maximus, George [Syncellus] the monk, and Paulus Diaconus, to assert that this apparent metachronism was very old among the Greeks. Thence the monk Philip in his *Τάγμα* to the emperor Alexius Comnenus said that from the Creation to the

[3] But his figures, even as corrected above, make only 5130, and we must still add 70 years from the Captivity to the Return, which have dropped out, to make up the 5500. The *true* sums would be: 2256+1 year and 6 months+950+70+430+610+427+70+187+330, making in all not 5500 but 5361 years and 6 months. See Palmer's *Egyptian Chronicles;* London, 1860.

Nativity there had passed 5505 years; as the Ethiopians also [the Copts and Abyssinians] of Egypt add a number of years, affirming that Christ was born[4] at (κατὰ τὸ) A.M. 5577, certainly erring in this metachronism, as others err much by prochronism. However, Epiphanius (in *Hæres.* lib. i.) against the Noetians, says that our Saviour was born in the 42d year of Augustus. Also in the same heresy, against the Antidico-Marianitæ, he says: 'In the 30th year of Herod I., son of Antipater, our Saviour was born in Bethlehem, which was the 42d of Augustus.' And Clemens Alex.: 'From the Nativity to the death of Commodus there are in all 194 years, 1 month, and 10 days.' And Justin Martyr in his second apology to Antoninus Pius: 'One hundred and fifty years ago, in the time of Cyrenius, Christ was born.' Clemens then, the author of the *Stromata*, was right when he wrote as he did (lib. i.). . . . Hence we may say what Basil said of the philosophers: 'No single word of theirs is fixed and immovable; he that comes later always upsetting him that went before.' So it is with the chronologers: they agree in nothing, but reckon from different epochs; as the Alexandrians from the era of Actium; whence Dio Cassius speaks of the day on which Alexandria was founded as being a festival. Others reckon by the Olympiads; others by the Jubilees and the Consulships: wherefore they begin from the first or second taxing (ἀπογραφὴ) of Cyrenius, who put the Jewish race under tribute, and made a census of their property. [And, after a quantity of the most prodigious nonsense and inaccurate quotations of chronological discrepancies, without any thread of connection, he continues thus:] From what has preceded it is made clearer than the sun that our reckoning is correct and certain, viz. that of 5508 years, as George Syncellus witnesses that he has found in old and exact copies that Christ was born in the consulship[5] of Sulpicius Camerinus and Caius Poppæus. And Matthæus Cigala in his

[4] They affirm nothing of the kind. They place the nativity in their A.M. 5501, and the crucifixion in their A.M. 5531, which by the omission of 8 years later seems drawn down so as to end Aug. 29 in *our* A.D. 42; and then if any blunderer makes *them* to confound their own era of the crucifixion with that of the nativity, and adds 42 to 5531, he may so obtain 5576 complete, or 5577 current years.

[5] *i.e.* in A.D. 9; the year of Syncellus, like that of the Coptic monk Anianus, whom he followed, being drawn down apparently by his omissions of years of the emperors later to our A.D. 9.

New Synopsis reckons 5508; and Ælstedius in iii. of his Encyclopædia. . . . But I hear some one crying out behind me and shouting, 'Enough of these thy long episodes! Turn, O racer, thy colt towards the goal.' I obey; and having urged my foaming horse with the whip, I go willingly back towards the goal.

CHAP. V. *How the blessing of the water was performed twice, once on the eve, and again on the festival itself, of the Lights (i.e. of the Theophany or Epiphany, τῶν Φώτων).*

Nicon had ordered it to be performed only once, and that in the night, because in the night the Lord was baptised. But the blessing of the water (the *ἁγιασμὸς*) on the eve is for the new month (*νουμηνία*). The Russians had had a superstitious custom of plunging lighted candles into the water; but the patriarchs did not do this. [Then follows a digression about the days of the week.]

CHAP. VI. *How some of the Russian bishops were unwilling to subscribe the deposition of Nicon.*

Especially Paul the metropolitan of Krootitz and Hilarion archbishop of Riazan were unwilling, on account of certain expressions about absolute obedience to the emperor in the patriarchal tomes. [This chapter was first shown to the translator (in Russ) by M. Titoff at C.P. in 1851, and later by the archimandrite Porphyrius at Jerusalem in the spring of 1854.]

On the 14th January 1667 all the bishops met in the new patriarchal palace about the subscription of the act for the deposition of Nicon: and there arose some disagreement on account of certain little expressions (*ῥηματίσκια*) contained in the report (*ἀναφορᾷ*), which were misunderstood and wrested by Paul the metropolitan of Kroutitz and Hilarion archbishop of Riazan, *who seemed to be pillars* of this local synod, and by some others of the bishops who followed them. And on account of the same they were altogether unwilling to subscribe, fearing not a little where no fear was; especially as they were unreasonably wresting the words, and gratuitously behaving as men of no understanding, with obstinacy and self-will; which turned greatly to their own hurt, on account of the disagreement, and their insubordinate audacity and impudence. They went away, both of them, without being brought to reason, while all the rest had

subscribed. And on this account the emperor was much disturbed: and still more were the most holy patriarchs astounded at the disregard shown *even* to their own most exalted entreaty. And so at length the synod separated, not without some disorder (*σφαδασμοῦ*), and not without a provision and command that examination should be made of this part of the patriarchal tomes in their several cells, and an answer given by each in writing as succinctly as possible after two days. And here the idea occurs to me of setting forth from its origin and principle the essential and radical cause of the schism, for more accurate knowledge and complete information respecting this business. For falsehood is manifold (*πολύσχεδες*), according to Theodoret, but the truth simple and single.

Well then, in chap. ii. of the patriarchal tomes, among other things, it was laid down that every man, whether bishop or patriarch, is bound to yield and submit himself to the reigning sovereign in all *political* matters and causes; so that there be only one lord and leader. And Homer also, the swan of poets, sings somewhere of the ruler, speaking with reference to Agamemnon, *εἷς κοίρανος ἔστω, εἷς βασιλεύς*. And, as Alexander replied to Darius, 'One sun reigns over the whole hemisphere.'

St. Epiphanius tells us that there are three preëminent graces of the Holy Ghost, namely, prophecy, priesthood, and royalty. But which of these three sacred gifts is to be thought the first is very doubtful, on account of the diversity of men's judgments and ideas. That the grace of unction is common to all these three gifts is manifest to all and self-evident, besides that it is to be inferred from the holy scriptures. For the Lord says in the book of Exodus, chap. xxix., to Moses: 'And thou shalt take the oil of unction, and pour it on the head of Aaron, and shalt anoint him.' Here we see the legal unction of the high-*priest*. Wherefore the high-priest (or bishop) is and remains 'the anointed of the Lord.' Also see Leviticus, chap. viii. But the *prophet* also is called 'the anointed of the Lord,' according to the third book of Kings, where it is said to Elijah the Tishbite: 'And Elisha, the son of Shaphat of Abel Meholath, shalt thou anoint to be prophet in thy room.' In which same manner, it is said, Zacharias also anointed his son John to be prophet in his room, before he was slain; [for he it was] who was slain between the temple and the altar, because he had anointed him while yet

an infant lying in the Holy of holies. Moreover, it is certain that the *king* also is called the Lord's anointed, as is shown by the first book of Kings, chap. x., where it is written that Samuel anointed Saul to be king: 'And Samuel took the horn of oil, and poured it on his head, and said to him: The Lord hath anointed thee to be ruler over Israel, and thou shalt rule the Lord's people: and the Spirit of the Lord shall come upon thee, and thou shalt prophesy with the prophets, and shalt be changed into another man.' But when the Lord repented that He had made Saul king over Israel, and set him aside, Samuel the prophet heard again from the Lord: 'Fill thine horn with oil, &c.; and come, go to Jesse the Bethlehemite. And Samuel took the horn of oil, and anointed David in the midst of his brethren. And the Spirit of the Lord came upon David from that day forth.' And after the death of Saul the men of Judah came and anointed David there, to reign over the house of Judah (2 Kings ii. 4.). No one, then, of these three dignities is in respect of the anointing before the others; neither the king before the prophet, nor the priest before the king. For all three are the anointed of the Lord, and differ nothing in respect of their unction from one another, but are truly brethren and equals.

Still we must inquire which of these three gifts is first in point of time—prophecy, priesthood, or royalty? Epiphanius says (*ἐν τῷ παναρίῳ*) expressly that Adam had the gift of prophecy; and so also Abel, and Seth, and the prophet Noah. Wherefore prophecy is the most ancient of all the three. In like manner Suidas also speaks, under the head Adam, saying that being made by the hand of God, and in his image and likeness, he was rightly called the first sage. And the scripture says that God, after making all beasts and cattle and creeping things and fowls, brought them to Adam, to see what he would call them. The same appears in his naming of his wife Eve. Having, then, such knowledge, our first ancestor, besides prophecy, had also priestly acts and offices, arts, letters, sciences, and all manner of inventions and instruction, and laws both written and unwritten, and all things else that are needful for human life and society. Whence we may conclude that Adam was not only a prophet, but also priest, and farther king, and was adorned with all the three graces of the Spirit. And that he was the first priest and king is plain from the Psalms, where it is said, as from the

mouth of the first man: 'Thou hast fashioned me, and laid thine hand upon me;' all but saying expressly that by this imposition of hands He has ordained him the first or the chief priest. And that Adam was also made a king by the Almighty is clear from the psalm which says: 'Thou hast made him a little lower than the angels; thou hast crowned him with glory and honour, and hast set him over the works of thine hands.' Wherefore no one is first; but all these three gifts are together equal and simultaneous, having their beginning from Adam, who was high-priest, prophet, and king, as aforesaid.

CHAP. VII. *Whether the high-priesthood and the empire are ever united?*

Answer: Yes! In his treatise against the Melchisedechian heresy Epiphanius says that the first act of priesthood in uncircumcision is performed by Abel, the next by Noah, and the third by Melchisedec, who was king of Salem and priest of the most high God. And St. Paul in his epistle to the Hebrews writes that this man, 'being first named by interpretation king of righteousness, and afterwards also king of Salem, that is, of peace, remaineth a priest for ever,' on account of us who are now priests of Christ, through whom, as instruments, Christ sacrifices and is offered in sacrifice (as Ecumenius says, commenting admirably and luculently on this place). So we see that the high-priesthood *is* found conjoined with royalty. And this is certified to us still more from the propinquity contracted by intermarriage between the two tribes (of Judah and Levi), the sacerdotal and the royal, Judah and Aaron. For we read in Exodus that Aaron took to wife Elisabeth daughter of Aminadab, sister of Naasson, who was of the tribe of Judah. But the Jewish law, as St. John Damascene says (lib. iv.), forbade one tribe to intermarry with another. And so likewise Theophylact (ch. i.) says it was the law not to take a wife from another tribe, nor even from another *φρατρία*: and this to avoid any confusion of their inheritances; but still more on account of the saving generation of Christ, God incarnate, as Nazianzen sings in his poem *περὶ Χριστοῦ γενεαλογίας*·

Δαυΐδας Σολομώντε Νάξαντ', ἐξ ὧν ὁ μὲν ἦλκεν
Ὥστε ῥόου μεγάλου ποτάμου βασιλήϊον αἷμα,

Αὐτὰρ ὀγ' εὐαγέωντε φαεινοτάτων θ' ἱερήων·
Χριστὸς δ' ἀμφότερ' ἔσχεν, ἄναξ μέγας ἀρχιερεύς τε.

Wherefore also Elisabeth is said to be cousin to the Blessed Virgin. For Joachim was of the tribe of Judah, and Anna his wife, as he says, of the tribe of Levi. Hence they who were successively begotten to be kings were also priests, and were so called; especially after the carrying away captive to Babylon, when Aristobulus, the son of Jonathan, was at once reigning king and high-priest; and he first of all the Jews took and wore a royal diadem, having changed, as Josephus says, the government into a monarchy. And of such, who were at once kings and high-priests, must be understood what he writes in lib. iv. of his Antiquities: 'But let him do nothing without the approval of the high-priest and the senate' (the sanhedrim or council). Such rulers from the tribe of Judah ceased not till the coming of Christ himself. But so soon as he himself, being God incarnate, was born at Bethlehem of Judea, in A.M. 5508, the order and succession was broken off and stopped in the person of Alexander, who was of priestly and royal descent, being the son of Alexandra, also called Selene, as writes the veracious Josephus; after whom there reigned Herod of Ascalon, a stranger, who obtained from Rome the royal crown and permission to rule, to which he had otherwise no claim, as Eusebius Pamphili relates. But enough of this. To go more into details is not to our present purpose: only it will be worth while to trace out in what sense and through what gifts or graces our Lord Jesus Christ is called 'Christ' or 'Anointed.'

We say, then, that he is so called on account of all the three gifts above mentioned; that is, for the unction of prophecy, the unction of priesthood, and the unction of royalty, as will be plain from the holy scriptures. Of prophecy, from Deut. xii.: 'A prophet like unto me,' &c.; John v.: 'For Moses spake concerning me;' and Matt. iv.: 'There shall not be left one stone upon another,' &c. And of priesthood, from the Psalms: 'Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchisedec;' 'Wherefore God hath anointed thee,' &c.; and Is. lxi. And lastly of royalty, as being of the seed of David, according to Matthew and Luke; and from that place in the Psalms: 'Thy throne, O God, endureth for ever; the sceptre of thy kingdom

is a right sceptre.' But of this kingly dominion of our Lord we shall say more elsewhere. What has been said here is enough for our present purpose and question.

CHAP. VIII. *Whether this unction which is given is to be understood materially or intellectually?*

Constantine Manasses, in his Chronology, says of Charles king of the Gauls [of the Franks], and after the division of the double-headed eagle the first autocrat of the West, that he was anointed after a Judaical fashion, contrary to what was proper, by Pope Leo III. of Rome; as also his son Louis was anointed with holy oil to be king of Italy, being so made an anointed of the Lord. And the priests and bishops also of the Western Church are anointed with the holy oil of the chrism in their ordination, according to the old custom of the Jews, as Ephrem Syrus testifies (and now in like manner do the Jacobites also; and when any of them are ordained, they are anointed with *μύρον*); whereas the bishops and priests of the Eastern Church have never been anointed with myron, or sensible oil, as is clear also from the troparion in the great vespers for St. Nicholas 'anointed with intellectual unction' (*μύρῳ χρισμένος νοητῷ*). But at what time and from what suggestion the emperors of the East began to be anointed with the holy myron is very difficult to say for certain. Those, however, who are best informed about the details of history think it most probable that after the capture of C.P. by Michael Palæologus, who drove out the Franks, and from Ephesus in Asia reintroduced the sceptres of the Romans into the capital with great glory and renown, he introduced also this custom, in order that the emperors of the East might not seem to come short of those of the West in any privileges. Let it be so, those will say who hold a contrary opinion: but why are the Eastern emperors anointed with myron and not with holy oil? the myron being by no means allowed except for an ineffaceable seal and security against assaults or wiles of the enemy. To this and other like questions let others answer if they can and have leisure. Simeon of Thessalonica says: 'After the first prayer he pours upon his head the holy myron in the form of a cross, showing that Christ has anointed him, and that He who has conquered by the cross will make him a conqueror.' See what he writes: that he does not pour the

myron *sacramentally*, as in other cases, but only for a certain spiritual sweet odour, and general fragrance of the future life and conduct of him who is anointed; because, according to the apostle, we all are a sweet odour of Christ. Thence in Question and Answer xxiii. the same Simeon adds, that he who returns [to the Church] after denying Christ is anointed by us with myron, but not rebaptised; that baptism gives life itself in Christ Jesus, but the myron adds the life and breath of Christ and holiness as a seal. There is no sacrament in such application of it as is made to kings, where only the *matter* is present, but not joined with the same *form* (εἶδος), with the same idea, intention, and purpose. But that originally our *Roman* emperors were only crowned, and were not anointed, the ecclesiastical historians prove, all but repeating the verse of David's psalm: 'Thou hast set a crown of pure gold upon his head.' So Marcian was crowned by Anatolius, and many others, whom it would be tedious here to enumerate; who were crowned by the most holy patriarchs, but not anointed. And thus much suffices to our purpose, which is to show that they who are associated both intellectually and sensibly should be crowned, through which chrism they are also called 'Christs of the Lord,' and rightly named βασιλεῖς, being βάσεις of the people (λαοῦ) in all nations.

CHAP. IX. *Of the meeting of the bishops to consider the question previously proposed, whether the Patriarch be subject to the Emperor?*

The day appointed came, and all the bishops assembled, fired with the flame of fraternal charity, in the new patriarchal palace, under the presidency of the two most blessed patriarchs Paisius and Macarius, each bringing with him in writing his own contribution *ex abundanti* (ἐκ περιουσίας) towards the solution of the ill-boding discussion (τῆς δεινῆς). And with godly zeal the passages which had been collected and which seemed to make in favour of the honour and reverence of the episcopate were brought forward, and likewise those αὐχήματα which seemed to be in favour of royalty were publicly read. And the second discourse [third book] of St. John Chrysostom concerning priesthood was adduced, a passage being quoted thence word for word thus: 'The office of priesthood is performed on earth, but it is to be referred to the class and order of heavenly things. And

that with reason. For it was not any mortal, not any angel, not any archangel, not any other created power, but the Paraclete himself, that instituted such an order; who taught and empowered mortal men while still dwelling in the flesh to embrace and conceive mentally the ministry of angels.' And again, below: 'For the priest stands not bringing down fire from heaven to consume the oblations set forth, but that grace, flowing into the sacrifice, may through that very same [sacrifice] inflame the minds of all, and render them purer than silver melted and purified in the fire.' And again: 'For they who inhabit the earth and live thereon have it committed to them to dispense things that are in heaven; they have power given to them which God has given neither to angels nor archangels: for it has not been said to them, "Whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven." Earthly princes also have indeed the power of binding, but it is of binding bodies only; but that bond of priests of which I am speaking affects also the soul itself, and reaches even to the heavens; so that whatever the priests shall have done below, those same things God ratifies on high, and the Lord confirms the sentence of his servants. For what else can you say of this, but that all power over heavenly things is conferred on them by God? For whosesoever sins, he says, ye shall retain, they are retained. What power, I pray, can be greater than this only? The Father has given universal power to the Son. But I see that the same universal power has been delivered by the Son to them. For they are exalted to that authority, even as if they were already translated to heaven, and raised above human nature, and exempted from our passions.'

Here the synod, rising up, cried aloud: 'Wherefore, O excellent man, didst thou not recite what St. Chrysostom says at the beginning of that same book iii., a passage which is more precious than gold and topaz, viz. "The choice being offered of priesthood, which is as much above royalty as spirit is above flesh"?'

The metropolitan of Gaza replied: 'It was not of dishonesty, but merely for *dear* brevity's sake, that the golden words of the golden-mouth were passed over, and only a short extract from them given; so much, that is, as seemed requisite and useful.'

Simon archbishop of Vologda rose and said: 'See, here it is clearer than the sun that Chrysostom asserts the grade (*βάθρον*) of the episcopate to be above that of royalty.'

The metropolitan of Gaza replied: 'We must first examine what was the mind of that great master, and to what purpose he was speaking when he said this, and then proceed to the examination of the words themselves, which clearly and wisely show that in *spiritual* matters the bishop exceeds and transcends the imperial dignity; which truth is not at all contrary to the patriarchal tomes, since they lay it down that in *civil* matters only the king or emperor (*βασιλεὺς*) is first.'

'True,' replied the archbishop: 'but remember and ponder the proverb of Solomon, which teaches all men, and so also the clergy, to turn neither to the right hand nor to the left, but to go only by the middle way, which cannot lead wrong and which is most royal, which is the king's highway. Remember that thou also thyself art a bishop, and one of the rulers of Christ's people, *and so thou oughtest to uphold rather the rights of the bishops than extol rhetorically the rights of the* [*secular*] *rulers*.'

On this the metropolitan of Gaza answered: 'I declare that I am not a creature of the emperor (*φιλοβασιλεὺς*), nor a *φιλαλέξιος* (a creature of Alexis), as of old Hephaestion was called *φιλαλέξανδρος* (the friend of Alexander) humorously, but one who rightly divides the word of truth, as a spiritual herald, wearing the oracle, that is the *ἐγκόλπιον* itself, on the middle of my breast, as an amulet of truthfulness, as a type of openness (*ἐπιδηλώσεως*), and as a sort of seal of the sincere divine grace. Come hither, then, my brother and fellow-minister; look deeper and more accurately into the precise words themselves of Chrysostom, as into precious stones or metals, and thou wilt perceive beyond a doubt that the episcopate is as much above the empire as the soul is better than the body, as being the *ἐντελεχεία* (the perfecting element in the whole constitution). Therefore, as the outward man, the sense, that is, performs the sensible energies, and the inner man, on the other hand, the soul, performs the inward energies, thus also the bishop is occupied about the spiritual matters of the Church, and the king about the secular matters of the kingdom, each keeping in their integrity his own properties, each revolving about his own sphere, and occupied

with his own axis of jurisdiction, keeping the tribunals, and balancing equally the scales of justice.'

The bishops said: 'Have ye in your hands here ready any other testimonies, for clearer illustration and proof?'

The most blessed patriarchs replied: 'Yes; we have abundance from the sixth discourse [or book] of the same Chrysostom about priesthood: "But when he invokes the Holy Ghost and consummates the most awful sacrifice, and then touches the common Lord of all, in what rank shall we place him,—tell me? or how great purity shall we demand of him, and how great piety? For consider of what quality ought those hands to be which so minister? of what character should be the tongue which is to utter those words? what should be purer and chaster than the soul which receives so great a Spirit? Then the angels also stand about the priest, and every order of celestial spirits cries aloud, and the place around the altar is filled with them, in honour of Him who lies thereon. And of this indeed there is enough to persuade us even in the very nature of the mysteries which are then transacted. But farther I have once heard a certain person relate that an old man, a priest of admirable virtue, and used to see revelations, told him of a vision once vouchsafed to him, in which at that time he saw suddenly a multitude of angels, clad in white robes, encircling the altar, and bending down, as if any one should see soldiers standing in presence of a king; and I, for my part, believe it. And another related to me, not having had it from any third person, but having seen and heard it himself, that when Christians are at the point to die, if they have received these mysteries with a pure conscience, angels surround and conduct them hence, out of reverence for That which they have received."'

Here Stephen archbishop of Souzdal rose, and said: 'Here I need thy learned comment, O brother and fellow-minister Paisius; and I request thee to explain what Chrysostom means by introducing such considerations.' And the metropolitan of Gaza replied: 'Manifestly Chrysostom is here insisting and plainly representing how great ought to be the purity of the hierophant who stands before and circles that holy and awful altar, which attracts the many-eyed intellectual spirits, writing down everything in the book of life. Thence the elder Mardadinus, as you may see in the Leimonarion of John Moschus, says:

"When I see the advent of the Holy Ghost, then I consummate the liturgy." And another bishop, being blamed by Agapetus bishop of Rome for his slowness in pronouncing the words of the divine transubstantiation, replied: "I did not see, as has been usual with me, the advent of the Holy Ghost." Something of the same kind is related by Amphilochius respecting Basil the Great, when writing about the Holy Ghost: "We say before and after certain other words as having great force in relation to the mystery, having received them from unwritten teaching; wherefore we also add in our prayers and say the following: O Lord, who at the third hour didst send down thy most Holy Spirit on thine apostles, &c."'

'Let there be brought in,' said the two patriarchs, 'other farther testimonies of the divinely-inspired fathers.' And there was adduced St. Epiphanius bishop of Cyprus, who in his treatise against the Melchisedechians has the following words: 'The first act of priesthood in uncircumcision is performed by Abel, the next by Noah, the third by Melchisedec. And that Melchisedec was a man the apostle himself, in his epistle to the Hebrews, asserts, thus: But he whose descent is not reckoned from them received tithes of the patriarch, having brought out to Abraham, as we have it in Genesis, bread and wine; for he was priest of the most high God at that time; and he blessed him, and received tithes of him: since it was fitting that the priest of the most high God should be honoured by the servant of God, &c. He had not then, as the heretics imagine, come down from heaven. For the one, and only one, who came down from heaven is the Son of Man, as says the apostle John, the holy and truthful divine. Neither is Melchisedec the Holy Ghost, seeing that he is made like unto the Son of God. The Jews also deceive men, when they say that Melchisedec was just, good, and priest of the Most High, but that inasmuch as he was the son of a harlot, his mother's name was not mentioned, nor his father's known. For the name of Rahab, though she were a harlot, is written in the book of Joshua; and those of Zimri and Cosbi, who committed fornication, in the book of Numbers, though the latter was not of Jewish extraction. Farther, we find that the father of Daniel was a man named Sabaas; and in like manner we find the natural descent (*τὴν φύσει πατριαρχείαν*) of Elijah, which I will mention, thus: Elijah the Tishbite was brother to

Jaddua the priest, and so was himself also of priestly descent, being the son of Ahimaaz, the son of Zadok, the son of Ahitub, the son of Amariah, the son of Moriah, the son of Zarah, the son of Azziah, the son of Phinehas, and so up to Abraham.'

The metropolitan of Gaza rose, and, without being asked, said: 'I will speak to this passage with the permission of all of you. This traditionary genealogy given by the illustrious Epiphanius (*τοῦ ἐπιφανοῦς τούτου Ἐπιφανίου*), as being himself of Hebrew origin, is beautiful, and indeed extremely curious; but it makes nothing whatever to our doubt and question, which is not about succession, but about the preëminence of the priest or the king. So, if there is any other special testimony, let it be brought forward before the synod.'

Whereupon there was immediately brought forward a passage in the treatise against the heresy of the Nazaræans, where St. Epiphanius inquires how we are to understand what is said by the archangel, that Christ should sit, according to the scriptures, on the throne of David: 'Thus with an oath the Lord sware, "Of the fruit of thy body will I set upon thy seat:" "The Lord sware, and will not repent:" for the promise of God is without repentance. Certainly, Christ was born of the seed of David; and St. John the Evangelist says: They came to anoint him to be king; and he knowing it, retired, and hid himself in a city called Ephraim, in the wilderness.' He answers, explaining admirably the text, thus: 'For the throne of David and the royal seat is the priesthood in the holy Church; which dignity of royalty and high-priesthood at once our Lord, having conjoined, has given to his holy Church, removing into it the throne of David, which is not to fail for ever. For there by succession the throne of David remained till the coming of Christ himself, they that were rulers from the tribe of Judah not ceasing till he came for whom it was reserved. And that was the expectation of the Gentiles, as he says. For the rulers who were from Judah by succession ceased at the coming of Christ, having governed till then. For the time was interrupted and stopped when, Christ being born in Bethlehem, it stopped in the person of Alexander, who was of royal and priestly descent; after which same Alexander this lot ceased, after him and Salome, who is also called Alexandra, in the time of Herod the king and the Roman emperor Augustus, Herod being an alien. But the

royal seat having lapsed in Christ to the Church, the royal dignity removed from the bodily house of Judah and Jerusalem, after the flesh, and the throne is set up in the holy Church of God for ever, resting its dignity on a double claim of royalty and high-priesthood. And the royal dignity from our Lord Jesus Christ is after two ways; one, that he is of the seed of king David after the flesh; the other, that he is a greater king from everlasting, according to his godhead: but the priestly, because he is high-priest and the head of all high-priests [or bishops] after him, the apostle James, who is called the Lord's brother, being immediately, after the ascension, made the first bishop. He gave then,' continues this holy father, 'to them that were appointed by himself the kingdom; and his throne remaineth for ever; and he sits to the end, reigning on the throne of David, not by any means having taken away the kingdom of David, but having given it to his servants and bishops of the Catholic Church.'

On hearing this passage the synod said: 'Now what hast thou to say in answer to this, O thou hierophant of Gaza? Behold here is a solution to our question plainer than the sun, that the throne of the episcopate excels every other throne, and consequently also the royal dignity itself.'

The metropolitan of Gaza answered: 'Since we are not of them that dispute egotistically for victory, but of them, if you please, that seek to be as exact as possible (*τῶν ἰριούντων, ἀλλάγε τῶν ἀκριβούντων*)—I use the words of the sophist Aristides of Smyrna, who so answered Marcus Antoninus emperor of the Romans—let a short space be allowed me to consider and to look into this eloquent passage of the most illustrious (epiphanestatos) and most divine Epiphanius; and let us for the moment go on to the other testimonies, if there are any more ready.'

The bishops answered: 'We have a great abundance of testimonies; only do thou open wide the doors of thine ears.' So there was read from Gregory Nazianzen a passage (from his defence of himself) where he speaks thus: 'Who is he who moulds, as men mould forms of clay, for the passing hour, him who is the champion of truth, him who is to live with the angels and give glory with archangels, and send up to the supernal altar his sacrifices, and be a priest with Christ, who is to renew

the creature and restore the image of God, and to create for the world to come; and, to say what is more, who is to be a god, and to make the God whose ministers we are? And where are they who lie prostrate? and where are they who send?' Also the heaven-revealing Basil, in the fifth prayer of the office of the Εὐχόλαιον, prays thus: 'O Lord our God, who didst breathe upon thy disciples and say, "Receive the Holy Ghost," who hast also called me, though a sinner, to the holy and most exalted order of the priesthood, and hast vouchsafed me to enter into the sanctuary itself, within the veil, into the holy of holies, and to celebrate thy heavenly mysteries, and offer to thee gifts and sacrifices for our own sins and for the ignorance of thy people, and to mediate for thy rational sheep; do thou, O thou all-good King, hear my prayer in this hour and holy day, and at every time and place, and hearken to the voice of my supplication," &c. From which passage we collect two things: one, that the priest is a god upon earth, according to the words of the psalm, "I have said, Ye are gods, and all of you sons of the Most Highest:" and farther, that every other order upon earth is excelled and overtopped by the most exalted order of the priesthood.' Lastly there was read the first epistle of Gregory Dialogus [*i. e.* of Gregory the Great, Pope of Rome], which he wrote to the emperor Leo the Isaurian, and in which he expresses himself thus: 'Thou knowest, O emperor, that the dogmas of the holy Church are not matters for kings, but for the bishops; and so they will be safely determined. For this the bishops have been set over the churches, abstaining from public matters' (Pause; and take notice of this, '*abstaining from public*,' that is, from *political matters*); 'and kings in like manner are to abstain from ecclesiastical matters, and keep to those which have been committed to them (that is, to political). But the common counsel and consent of Christian kings and pious bishops is one power, when matters are managed with peace and charity.' All cried out aloud: 'O, excellent distinction! O, most excellent interpretation and most wise explanation, which gives to each, to the priest and to the king alike, his own!' In like manner also in the second epistle of the same Pope of Rome to Leo the Iconoclast: 'Thou hast written that "I am both king and priest, according to that text of the holy Apocalypse which says: And thou hast made us priests and kings." And this the emperors thy predecessors illustrated both in word

and deed, when they founded and took care of the churches, seeking out, together with the bishops, the truth with loving desire and zeal for orthodoxy; as Constantine the Great, and Valentinian the Great, and Constantine the father of Justinian, the emperor of the [Fifth] synod. These emperors reigned after a godly manner, and, in concert with the bishops, with one mind and counsel, assembled the synods, and sought out the truth of doctrine, and established and adorned the holy churches. These are indeed priests and kings, who did the part of both in fact. But thou, from the time that thou didst take the empire, hast not kept at all the definitions of the fathers; but, finding the holy churches clad in cloth of gold (κροσσωτοῖς), hast stripped them of their glory, and made them bare. For what are our churches but histories of the saints represented by painting? If any one take from thee thy royal robes, the purple, the diadem of thy head, the mantle (τὴν ἀλουργίδα), the ranks of thy guards, &c., thou wilt be considered by men as nothing, being left without show or form. For thou, doing what thou hast no right to do, hast made the churches to be unadorned and bare. For as the bishop has no right to intrude into the palace, and promote men to civil dignities or posts, so neither has the emperor the right to intrude into the churches (unless he means to break through his bounds) and make decrees for the clergy, or consecrate, or give the symbols of the holy mysteries, nor even to communicate without a priest. But each one of you, in whatever calling he has been called by God, in that let him abide.' 'See again,' said the bishops with one consent, 'Pope Gregory of Rome rebukes the emperor Leo the Isaurian, all but quoting verbally that verse of the psalm, "I did speak also against kings, and was not ashamed."' 'Yes,' said the two œcumenical patriarchs, 'when the reigning emperor or king *is a heretic*, he is rightly rebuked and condemned, as not submitting himself to the Catholic Church. A distinction therefore is to be taken in the question respecting kings: and we must *separate absolutely* from the religious and orthodox such as are impious and heretical in like manner as true priests also are distinguished from false priests, as St. Basil writes in his epistle to the people of Nicopolis. But since the day is spent, and the hour is almost too late, let the questions about the kingly office stand over till tomorrow.' And so all the assembly separated with a blessing.

CHAP. X. *How the bishops met, and the passages relating to the imperial and royal power were read.*

In the morning early all the bishops met in the new patriarchal palace, to bring forward the passages which seemed to make for the religious empire. And the patriarchs came both in their mandyas; and after having said the Ἄξιον ἐστὶν &c. and given the usual blessing, they bade all stand in their places, and said words to the following effect: 'A promise is a serious thing, which should be demanded and fulfilled at once. Whence also the prophet Jonas, remaining imprisoned alive in the belly of the whale, prayed saying: "What I have vowed, that I will pay to the Lord for my salvation." Wherefore, seeing that yesterday the metropolitan of Gaza promised us to explain that place of St. Epiphanius where he says, that the throne of David and his royal seat remain in the holy Church of Christ in the priesthood, let him speak and make clear this passage as well as he can; and then let us proceed to the passages relating to the Christian monarchy.'

And the metropolitan of Gaza, taking the permission given to him, spoke thus: 'Though comparison in general seems only to beget strife and hatred, on account of the diversity of men's minds and judgments, still, when the comparison is for the exhibition and knowledge of the sincere truth, it seems to be not only not odious and disgusting, but very laudable. Moreover a comparison and parallel is to be understood according to a certain analogy and likeness, not as if it held good absolutely and in every point: for else it would not be a comparison but an analysis (ἐξίτασις). It seems, then, that the priesthood is superior to the earthly kingdom in respect of its full spiritual power, since no man else can forgive sins but the bishop alone. "Who can forgive sins," said the Jews, "but God alone?" But the bishop is called a god upon earth, as says St. Clement in the Apostolic Constitutions, and likewise Gregory of Nazianzum. But though in blessing the priest excels the king (wherefore also Melchisedec, being priest of the Most High, sanctified Abraham: and without controversy the less is blessed of the greater, according to St. Paul), still in respect of their unction there is no difference; for this is common to both. Hence St. Cyprian, in his treatise about the chrism, cries, saying: "To-

day in the church is made the *μύρον*, wherein balsam is mixed with oil, and thereby appears clearly, and through it is signified plainly the union of the episcopal and royal power and dignity. For through the chrism is understood the Holy Ghost itself. For according to the word of the prophet: The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, wherefore he has anointed me, &c. For he was sanctified or consecrated as a man by the Holy Ghost: yet he has his essence immutable; for God is unchangeable." "I have also a certain ointment" (*μύρον*), says Gregory of Nazianzum in his homily; "but an ointment with which only priests and kings are anointed, which is composed of many and costly ingredients, and which has been poured out for us (for, Thy name is ointment poured out), composed by the art of a great unguent-maker. May it be vouchsafed me to breathe the sweet odour of this ointment before God!" Thence Dionysius the Areopagite says, when treating of the ceremony of the holy chrism, that "the divine hierarchy uses it for the consecration of every church, representing plainly Jesus, who sanctifies himself as the heavenly sanctifier; to whom also every mind is divinely dedicated as a temple; and the sanctification pervading all that is done in the church towards us, sanctifies us also." The unction, then, with chrism gives the illapse of the Holy Ghost. And as the composition of the chrism is of divers most fragrant materials by which they that are touched with it are made fragrant, according to the amount of their participation, so also he who is anointed receives the mystical breath and fragrance of the all-holy Spirit, and godly souls, as doves, are delighted to be anointed with the chrism. "Dost thou wonder how one and the same Spirit perfects prophets, anoints kings, consummates priests, and appoints pastors and teachers? Understand," cries my friend the patriarch of Jerusalem Cyril, in his Catechetical Lectures; "even as the same rain, which comes down from above in spring, decks the earth in many forms and fashions of plants and flowers," and paints it with myriads of flowers as with colours, and here bursts forth the rose, there the violet laughs, the lily smiles, the hyacinth rises, opening from its delicate calices. I will parody a little the poetry of St. Gregory of Nazianzum, in reference to the dignity of the priesthood and the empire. For he sings in the book of his poetry the following words, as a melodious swan:

"Nature has not given two suns; but two Romes, luminaries of the whole world, the old and the new capital, separate so far from each other as that the one should shine before the sun [*i. e.* in the east], the other in the west, and match beauty with beauty harmoniously" [being in the original six Greek verses].

'We know that the Creator has set in the firmament of heaven two great lights; the one to give light by day with its own, the other to lighten the night with reflected light. Both are very beautiful and useful towards all production and change in the whole world: and when they both equally shine and give light, so long all things are bright and rejoice. But when both, or either of them, fail or are eclipsed, then there is great lamentation and much distress. Now doubtless the lights of lights, which are most bright above all, are the bishop and the king in the bright firmament of the Church. And when both of these rightly divide the word of truth, there is universal gladness and rejoicing. But when they do not keep their feet straight, but suffer a lamentable eclipse, then, ay then, mourning comes on all, and much lamentation is heard. It is indeed a woeful spectacle when the lesser luminary, the moon, is suddenly darkened; but much more woeful is it when the greater luminary, the sun, is similarly darkened, as it was at the time of the crucifixion, when he came supernaturally upon the moon. "Remember," writes the Areopagite in his seventh epistle to the bishop Polycarp, refuting Apollophanes, "that we have seen the eclipse itself (ἔκπτωσιν), beginning from the east and going to the solar limit, and again returning not from the same quarter—and likewise the refilling (ἔμπτωσιν) and repurgation—but from the quarter diametrically opposite." Aforetime the priests, being themselves golden in their lives, celebrated with wooden patens and chalices; but now we, who are of brass and iron in our words and deeds, celebrate the sacred mysteries with golden patens and splendid chalices. Alas for the change! Alas for the transformation! Give me a bishop who shall have the zeal of Phinehas, the meekness of Moses, the presence of Elias, and I will prefer him to any Cesar or Augustus who has reigned on earth. But if there are of us bishops and *met*ropolitans who rule ill, and are of low manners (μιαροπολίτας), of whom I, thrice-wretched, am the first, what a shame shall be ours! what caution ought we not to use for the future! Alexander, the

son of Philip conquered the world; but he was unable to conquer himself, being overcome by his passions; and having the imperial mind taken captive, he was at last by excesses reduced to be altogether a bond-slave. Wherefore the emperor Trajan was thus counselled by his instructor Plutarch: "If thou directest thyself towards virtue, all will become straight and smooth to thee, and will tend more and more to turn out well and to help thee." For it is not only the king who ought to appear, and to be, above the rest, but also the ruler of the Church should be seen as a candle set on a golden candlestick, as a Pharos and a Colossus, giving light, and holding a torch to all the nations to enter the haven of calm security. Such a high-priest it was needful for us to have as is holy, harmless, undefiled, clearer than crystal, and purer, who in the flames of the fire shall not be consumed, but rather burnished. But *if the contrary shall appear in any case* (but I will say no more, lest I should anticipate evil), *one man will suffice for me as an example* instead of many, one who has been stripped synodically of the patriarchal rank and power, *Nicon I mean, who stands now as a layman outside the holy rails*, as having been born and promoted *not to bring peace but a sword* upon the holy Church of Christ, the royal and Davidical seat and bride-chamber, not considering—senseless man that he has been—the voice of the chief Shepherd and great Teacher, which crieth, "Peter, put up thy sword into its sheath;" all but upsetting him, and those like him, in sharply pulling him back *from his zeal to shed blood*, as Theophylact explains it, on the Gospel of St. John. But, O thou our ever-worshipful and heaven-established lord, great conqueror, and most faithful champion of the Church! stand as a palm-tree for many years. May thy youth be as that of the eagle, O thou most truly priest and king! For thou hast imitated and trodden in the footsteps of Theodosius the Great, of Justinian the Great, of the most Christian Constantine. Thou hast now been raised up by Christ our God as a new David, whom he has found, a man after his own heart: for thou didst not give sleep to thine eyes nor slumber to thine eyelids, until this divinely-convoked assembly, this numerous meeting, this splendid synod, had been collected and brought together by thy divinely-wise serenity; following the divinely-uttered voice, which clearly says in the Gospel of St. Matthew: "Where two or three are gathered together in my

name, there am I present in the midst of them." I will conclude my speech with the words of my patriarch of Jerusalem, Sophronius, by entreating you, O most holy patriarchs, with this most reverend synod, to make earnest and incessant prayers and supplications to God for our Christ-loving and most serene emperor; that the merciful and good God (whose power is equal to his will), being propitiated by your heaven-received prayers, vouchsafe to him length of many years, and give him the greatest victories and triumphs over the barbarians, and crown him with children's children, and hedge him round with divine peace, and make his sceptre strong and potent, to break the pride of all the barbarians, but especially of the Saracens, who for our sins have now beyond former expectation risen up against us, and hold all in bondage, with savage and brutal cruelty, and infidel and impious audacity. Wherefore I most earnestly beseech you, O most blessed patriarchs, to make most earnest prayer to Christ, that receiving the same favourably from you, he may overthrow the sooner their furious ragings full of madness, and bring them low, and make them the footstool of heaven-crowned kings, as before: that all the body politic of his empire may have fair weather in him, being palisaded round, and defended on all sides by his potent sceptre, and in the peace which they enjoy through him plucking the grapes of gladness. I have spoken. May you receive favourably what I have said.'

All applauded: and *especially the two œcumenical patriarchs;* who then desired that the basis of the Jewish kingdom, as contained in the divine scriptures, should be brought forward for consideration. And accordingly there was brought in and read from the first book of Kings (ch. viii.) the following passage: 'All the elders of Israel gathered themselves together and came to Samuel unto Ramah,' &c. [to the words:] 'Go ye every man to his city.'

The metropolitan of Gaza rose, and said: 'I wish myself to be your commentator here, and to explain the right of the kingdom or monarchy. And in the first place I will remark that the king is free from the laws, as Dio Cassius also shows (lib. iv.), being free from all necessity or accountability (*παραστάσεως*). Hence he does as he pleases, judging without being judged, and without being condemned, as having irresponsible dominion, and being himself living law. Wherefore also he is repre-

sented *as a god upon earth* among men; inasmuch as the Most High has given him the dominion. Hence the same properties as are in God belong also to the king, as once said the Pythagorean Diogenes, saying that "as God is to the world, so is the king to the state; and as the state is to the world, so is the king to God, whose character and image he is:" and that "*he may force women, as many and of whatever condition he will.*" The number indeed of wives which the king might take was limited by the Jewish council to eighteen, in imitation of the first king David, who lived in great eminence and wealth: and yet the wonderful Solomon exceeded this number of women, having taken a thousand, as we collect from the Song of Songs (ch. v.) also. And now I understand why the kings of the gentiles thought it unbecoming for them to appear very often in presence of their subjects, on account of the greatness of their dignity. Hence the king of Assyria, Artaxerxes, not only was unwilling to make a spectacle of himself, but even made a severe law to punish capitally any person who should come to him without being called, as we read in the book of Esther, thinking, it may be, that to be invisible exhibits a divinely-inhabited image of the invisible God, who also bears an image of such a king within himself. The king farther changes and re-institutes the customs and laws of his country, according to his own will and pleasure. For how often (tell me, I pray, was it not so?) did not the people of the Jews sin by going after idolatry, the most foul and hateful to God, because their king personally, and at first alone, was an idolater? For the saying is true, that the common people and the promiscuous crowd follows and does after the example of the king. *Μείζονος ἵκτε βοὸς καὶ ἀροῦν ἐδδάηκεν ἐλάσσων* (that is, "And from the bigger ox the lesser learns to plough"). Hence the Egyptians affected to walk lame, in imitation of their king Vulcan. The king on earth, then, is not circumscribed by the written laws, as being most self-sufficient, and not to be ruled by any; just as the king of the Argives, Agamemnon, is called by the tragic poet Æschylus *ἄκριτος πρύτανις*, that is, "unjudged or irresponsible ruler," as source and director of the laws being superior to the laws. Hence also the Cesar of the Romans was called *αὐτοκράτωρ* (autocrat) to signify his self-responsible (*αὐτοτελοῦς*) power and his absolutely perfect dignity. As also Justinian's novell cv. writes

that "God, the King of kings, has subjected the laws to kings, having given these latter as living law to all men beneath the moon."'

There was adduced also the relation which is given in the third book of Esdras (ch. iv.), though now not extant in Greek, as being doubted of and apocryphal, respecting the three Hebrew guards of the Persian absolute monarch Darius, who started amongst themselves this curious discussion and philosophical contest, amicably and as brethren disputing whether of these three were the strongest in this earthly life, wine, the king, or a beautiful woman? He then that said the king was the strongest spake freely to this effect: 'Are not, O men, they the strongest who are lords both of the sea and of the land, and masters of all things that are in them both? Such is the king, as being above all things, and ruler of all men, who do what he commands them. And if he sends them to make war and fight, they immediately go, digging through mountains and walls and towers. And if he speaks and commands, saying, Bowstring this man, they immediately bowstring him: and no word of the king do they disobey or evade. And whenever or wherever the soldiers conquer in war, all that they reduce or take captive or take as spoil they bring to him. In like manner also they who do not fight, but only cultivate the land and sow and reap, bring their tributes and imposts to the king. And if he, without any other will or judgment than his own, says, Slay this man, they slay him immediately,' &c.

The metropolitan of Gaza rose again, and said: 'Here also again I wish to appear once for all as your commentator, and briefly to paraphrase the words which say, "All pay tribute to the king, as being his subjects." For that afore-mentioned Persian king Darius, having had some Attic figs by some chance brought before him, and learning afterwards that they were from a foreign country not subject to him, sware their greatest oath never again to eat of them till he should have subjected to himself and enslaved that fig-bearing city of Athens; that the king might not be said to have eaten of what was not his own; but only and exclusively from his own possessions. And now ye may understand very clearly why it was that the empress Eudoxia refused to restore to the widow her field, because her own imperial foot had trodden there.' And here there was

adduced from the life of St. Epiphanius the story alluded to, as follows:

'A certain man, whose name is not mentioned, but who was noble, wealthy, and prosperous, had at a certain time been banished on the charge of having shown disrespect to the emperor, and so his property also had been confiscated. His wife, however, who had since become a widow, still retained and owned a plot of ground situate in the suburbs. It so chanced one day that the empress, taking her diversion, came that way, and stepped upon that field; upon which it was immediately remarked to her that she was going upon land not her own. Now the Roman law then in force was this, that, if the emperor or empress set his or her foot upon land belonging to another, or plucked of any of its fruits, such land could no longer be claimed or owned by any other, but belonged thenceforth to the emperor or empress. But John with the name of grace (*i.e.* John Chrysostom) rebuked her, saying, "Restore the field of the widow, O most dear daughter and sovereign! Hast thou not heard how Jezebel is exposed and pointed out as a warning by the divine scriptures, on account of the vineyard of an innocent man?" But the empress said to the patriarch: "Thou hadst better not reproach rulers to their face!" and thereupon she immediately ordered John to be turned out of the imperial chamber. And he, after he had gone forth, immediately ordered his archdeacon Eutychius to make her a return in kind, and not to allow the empress Eudoxia to enter the church. And on this account she had displeasure against the golden-mouthed and eloquent teacher: and calling to her St. Epiphanius of Cyprus, who had before been summoned to the capital, and was there at the time, she said to him: "Father Epiphanius, all the empire of the Romans is mine, and all the priesthood of the churches under my empire is now thine. Since John, who understands not how to behave himself orderly, being one of the priesthood, insubordinately contends against them that are sovereigns, I have for some time past been intending to make and assemble a synod, and to have this man cast out as unworthy of the priesthood, setting another in his stead in this chair, some one else who may be capable of exercising the priesthood; *that my empire may in all respects abide in peace.*" But St. Epiphanius replied to the empress in a tone of patient meekness: "Listen

to thy father, O my daughter. If on account of thine own personal affront thou seekest to have John thrust out of the Church, thy loving father and subject Epiphanius will not consent to thee in this. For sovereigns, O my child, above all others, ought to be ready to forgive any personal affront, inasmuch as ye also have a sovereign who is in heaven; against whom ye also continually sin; and he forgives you on the condition that ye also forgive them that affront you: as he says in the gospels, Be ye merciful, even as your Father which is in heaven is merciful." The empress rejoined to Epiphanius: "If thy fatherhood attempts to put any difficulty in my way, so as to prevent my banishing John, I will immediately reopen the heathen temples, and make the people to worship idols again: and I will make the end worse than the beginning."'

At this point the metropolitan of Gaza cried out aloud: 'Go now, and *deny, if thou canst*, O most reverend synod, *that sovereigns are provoked to wrath, and will not tolerate it*, if they see the heads of the Church *meddling with their imperial matters, seeing that they are scarcely to be withheld from* [*meddling themselves*] *with ecclesiastical matters*. Since, even though entreated by innumerable prayers, and helped along step by step, and turned into the straight path of virtue by meek and charitable petitions, they scarcely are brought to assent and yield to the incantations used to [tame] them, and to the persuasive, soft, and flexible tunes used to soften them.'

At length the synod separated on account of certain secret business, of which an account shall be given immediately below in the next chapter; and each one of us went home, with the prayer and blessing of the patriarchs, and with notice to reassemble on the morrow.

Chap. IX. *Of a memorial or petition presented secretly to the Patriarchs by the two Bishops.*

Those two bishops who have been mentioned already [as refusing to subscribe the patriarchal tome] heard what had taken place; and fearing greatly lest they should suffer some disagreeable consequences from their past obstinacy and self-will, they presented a written petition to the œcumenical patriarchs about the hour of midnight, praying and imploring them most humbly to intercede with the autocrat (*τὸν παντάνακτα*), &c. respecting

what they had murmured in objection, on a dark paper written upon not so much with ink as with the venom of asps. They alleged that Chrysostom has said that the priesthood is above the empire. And in confirmation and illustration of their position they instanced the very ancient custom which long ago got into the form for the consecration of bishops, that a bishop about to be consecrated should stand and tread upon the double-headed eagle, the Roman crown of the imperial power (I always thought it most absurd to interpret this to mean the character of the sublimely-soaring John the Divine, though such is the opinion of Simeon of Thessalonica). . . . They alleged farther that it was improper, or rather unlawful, that the bishops should kiss the hand of the king, and put themselves under a hand which is altogether unsealed [with unction], whereas even Simeon of Thessalonica, manifesting the utmost bitterness (*βαρυλυπώτατος διακείμενος*), has, among other things, written thus:

"'He that has just been ordained bishop receives the mandya with the stripes (lit. *rivers*, *ποταμοί*) in sign that he is a teacher, and a follower of Christ the first bishop, from whom also he has received the divine grace from heaven. And thence the divine grace is poured out upon the bishops in succession. Wherefore also he blesses with boldness, though he be the bishop of another city, having received the permission, however, at the time of his own [spiritual] wedding, having power to bless and to pray on that day only, as a gift and special privilege. Moreover, after the banquet, the new bishop is set upon a horse, and goes round the city-wall attended by guards, as a newly-made bishop communicating the divine grace newly given to him, and giving sanctification by his blessing. Wherefore also, as having boldness towards God, and having no small power by virtue of his ordination, he is sent to the king or emperor to make prayer for him and for the palace and the army; as having been made spiritually one of the anointed of the Lord, he blesses the potent emperor, the anointed of the Lord with ointment; and on taking leave he prays for his welfare and salvation. Now in former times this order was followed in a godly and becoming manner; wherefore also the prayer of the bishop was laudable and profitable. But *now*"—Remark, O divine and holy *synod*, these words, precious *above gold and topaz!*[6]—"*all is just the contrary.* For

[6] Palsius forgets that the petition of the two bishops is to the *two patriarchs*

the presentation is made, and the bishop comes to the sovereign, and prays: but, instead of being honoured with any honour for Christ's sake, he is dishonoured rather, as he is exhibited both in the light of one much inferior to him whom he blesses, and as a servant ministering of his servitude, and something less considerable than even the anagnosts, who on the Thursday in Easter week kiss the emperor on his hand and cheek, together with the clerks and the patriarch. For he goes up to the sovereign, and does reverence, and *kisses his hand*, after having made the prayer. And how is it that he who prays does this? And wherefore is it that, while the emperor kisses the hand of a common priest, the bishop upon his consecration, and upon his solemn prayer for the emperor, kisses the emperor's hands? This is contrary to all consistency. And see what takes place when he who has been sanctified by the Spirit, and consecrated a bishop, he whose hand is hallowed, so that he can ordain, and bless, and seal believers, himself fetters [his own hands], and kisses servilely hands which have not been consecrated to bless, hands secular and military, with holy and consecrated lips, which the day before or even that same day invite to the awful communion! Also, while the sovereign is seated, he stands in his presence. These things, if he were a private person, would be proper; as the apostle says, Honour the king. But when he is Christ's high-priest and vicar it ought not to be done thus: for the dishonour of him reverts to Christ. For they that are consecrated and that receive the apostolic power, though many, are all one in Him. But these improprieties have arisen not so much by the fault of emperors themselves, as from other men, from flatterers, who have mispersuaded them by men's words to do also even the greater acts of the episcopate, *so as even to promote bishops*, and to cause—alas!—men ordained by the Spirit as shepherds for such and such Churches to be translated elsewhere by men who have not the power and exercise of priesthood, and contrary to the mind of the Spirit. If there be need in any case, for more edification, that any bishop should be appointed to a greater city, this shall be done by the Spirit, by whom the bishop is consecrated, not by the secular power. Moreover per-

only, not to the synod; and he makes them exclaim in language of his own style, as *he* might have exclaimed if *he* had been adducing any passage, and calling the attention of the synod to a clause favourable to his own purpose.

sons are appointed in the same way to be hegoumens over monks and others consecrated to God, contrary to the will of the Spirit: and these loose and bind, having received this power from them that had not themselves the power of the grace: and they are ordained and preside as superiors over numbers, utterly disregarding those who have the grace. For this cause it is that our calamities have been multiplied, and we have been made small and few beyond all nations. And while we strive by force to have dominion over and to meddle with things not to be meddled with, strangers bear rule over us. And while we do acts not humane or charitable, our enemies, and the enemies of God, in consequence invade us. And while we think, alas! to make a gain by appropriating to ourselves sacred things, and by secularising things offered to God, we have lost what was really our own, and our adversaries reap our fruits and eat them before our eyes. But God grant that some remedy may be applied to this evil; and that the things of Cesar may be secured to Cesar, and the things of God to God; so that upon all that belongs to us there may be the blessing of God, and sacred things may be kept together, and secular things may increase; and not, on the contrary, be destroyed one of another. For the old enemy and destroyer is cunning in these things, and strives to implicate even the religious in the sin of sacrilege, and to compass the overthrow of holy and divine persons (*καὶ τῶν ἱερῶν καὶ ζηλων τὴν καθαίρεσιν ἐνεργήσῃ*). But may he, the evil one, be himself overthrown by God; and may they that are faithful and religious live piously and so as to please God; and may they receive in Christ, as the reward of their christian mind, deliverance from all their dangers and calamities, and increase of all good things!"'

They adduced farther a passage of Arethas metropolitan of Cesarea in Cappadocia, who on chap. xiii. of the Apocalypse, at the words, 'And Babylon the great came in remembrance,' interprets these words thus: '"By Babylon he does not intend old Rome, because in the times of heathenism many of the holy martyrs [through her] suffered cruel tortures and death. Nor does he mean the whole world; though there is something plausible and acceptable to many in the opinion that he names it Babylon, and great, as having the greatness (*τὸ μεγαλεῖον*) from the random eddies and changes (*περισπασμῶν εἰκαίων*)

of human life. For if the world were signified by Babylon, how could the *islands* be distinguished from the world, seeing that they are themselves parts of the world? We must, therefore, probably find another meaning for Babylon: and what shall this be? It is no other than the city of Constantine, in which once justice flourished, but now murderers, from the neck-and-neck competition of secular persons seeking to make themselves equal with ecclesiastical; *or rather not content with equality, unless some one of them shall take the supremacy*, to the kindling of the greater wrath of God. Wherefore also the Impassible Nature made a show of passion, so that the wine-cup of the fierceness of wrath should be given to Babylon."

'And ye in truth,[7] though ye are tyrannised over by the infidel Hagarenes, have for your patience and affliction worthy rewards and crowns from our Saviour, who shall be the righteous rewarder of all. But we thrice-wretched, who are thought so happy for living in the bosom and centre of Christendom, suffer all manner of constraint in our diœceses, and all manner of other inconveniences. And though, in spite of ourselves, we put up with and dissemble the greater part of the wrongs [which we suffer] from the boyars (*ὑπὸ τῶν ἀρχόντων*), *yet we shrink with trembling at the thought that the evil must go on and become worse when it shall be determined and made a fixed principle that the State is supreme over the Church.* And though we have no suspicion in our minds that we shall in any degree be wronged or hurt in this most happy time of the thrice-happy government of our heaven-defended and glorious and victorious emperor our hossoudar, the hossoudar Alexis Michaelovich—Almighty God forbid that we should ever conceive such a thought!—we nevertheless fear *for the future:* we would be cautious respecting possibilities (*τὸ ἄωρον εὐλαβούμεθα*): lest they who may come to bear rule in times to come, not perceiving [what is said to be] the true sense of these patriarchal tomes, should run into error, attending *merely to the letter*, which often killeth, being allured miserably and drawn aside to destruction. The thought of these abuses of the letter of the literal text, and of misinterpretations *likely* to be made[8] by *inexperienced translators, not perfectly skilled*

[7] Here the quotation ends; and Paisius must be continuing with the words of the two bishops in their petition addressed to the patriarchs.

[8] *Actually made* in the official Russian translation of the patriarchal tomes

in the Greek tongue, oppresses us. Therefore, as physicians of souls, as spiritual healers, doing good *without pay* (like the saints called *ἀνάργυροι*), we pray you to administer to us some potion to heal our pains—and we shall be healed—pouring in wine and oil convenient for the hurt, for a salutary cure. Yea, yea! Amen, amen! and give us your healing balms, and we shall be set up, we who at present appear to stumble, and not to walk upright, nor to follow the common sentence of the most reverend synod.'

This, *and more to the same purpose,* was the substance of their libel (or memorial).

Shortly afterwards the metropolitan of Gaza was called in to read the libel. And when he had read it, he understood its drift; and, shaking his head, he cried out: 'O truth, thou hast perished! falsehood now reigns, and condemnation sits in judgment! In truth the Russians are not worthy of so great a sovereign; a sovereign most christian and most religious, who wields a sceptre not of iron nor heavy, but soft and gentle, a hazel rod. I myself will answer this *most foolish and wicked* writing. For though I well know that to minds discontented and turbulent I shall seem to put myself forward over boldly, as *a mischief-maker* willing to foment scandals, a worker of contentions, a cause of fighting and sedition, still *I fear the condemnation of him who hid his talent in the earth,* I shrink from the blame of the disobedient and slothful servant, *inasmuch as the œcumenical patriarch Dionysius appointed me to be the interpreter, the guardian, and the champion of the patriarchal tomes.*[9] For this cause I enter into this great contest, this public *σκάμμα* or *πένταθλον, by no means bearing on my tongue the ox;*[10] no Harpocrates with my

sent from C.P., and translated at Moscow into *Latin by Paisius* and from *his* Latin into Russ, as may be seen by comparing the Greek and the Russ printed in parallel columns in Roumantseff's *Hossoudarstvennaia Grammata,* &c.

[9] Here is written on the margin of the MS., brought beyond a doubt into Egypt by the patriarch of Alexandria Paisius himself, the following note: '*Here he plainly lies.* He obtained [through Meletius and Stephen; see above, p. 84, 89], as was detected afterwards, letters [12th November, A.D. 1661], as if from the patriarch Dionysius: but *they were forged* by the management of *Meletius,* a monk of the Lavra, and written by the hand of a certain clerk whose name I purposely refrain from writing.' On this note the archimandrite Porphyry in his extracts, communicated to the English translator in 1851, had observed: 'It is plain that this annotator was minutely acquainted with the whole business.'

[10] Alluding to the passage, *βοῦς ἐπὶ γλώσσης μέγας βέβηκε, i. e.* being by no means bribed to keep silence,—but paid for advocating what I advocate.

finger to my lips, nor Pythagoras keeping a five years' silence, and more dumb than the fishes, but re-uttering that most sweet word of the philosopher, who once said honestly: "I love Socrates, I love Plato; but *I love more truth*, which stands alone, and is the first of all things." There was no need indeed, there was no need, in answer to this *incoherent and most rubbishy pack of words* (*τὴν ἀσύνδετον ταύτην καὶ φαυλοτάτην φλυαρίαν*), to interpose a long speech, to refute at length that continuous Lethe, or break up the substructions and foundations of the wretched tragedy. Still, yielding to the authority of the wise Solomon, who says plainly that one ought to answer a fool, lest he fancy at some time that he has spoken well, or has proposed what is to the point—therefore, that I may begin from the beginning—

'There are many questions raised by the ancients; and many still doubted of among ourselves, which excite excessive party-spirit, and occasion vehement disputings on both sides; as, for instance, whether of the two be more excellent, logic or rhetoric? as having the same subject matter, the one squeezing things together like a closed fist, the other opening them out broadly, like an open hand. Again, whether of these two be more important, painting or history (*ἱστορία*)? Plutarch gave his sentence, that painting is history silent, and history painting eloquent, &c. &c. Again, which is more excellent, skill in letters or in arms? Cæsar had both, &c. &c. Or the agricultural life or the pastoral? Abraham followed both, &c. But why should I multiply instances? The Homer of Nazianzum writes, *πρᾶξιν προτιμησεῖας ἢ θεωρίαν*; and answers most laconically and wisely "*Ἀμφω μὲν εἶσὶ δεξιαίτε καὶ φίλαι.*

'Thou askest whether of the two excels, priesthood or empire? and I reply that in one respect priesthood is to be preferred in honour (that is, in respect of spiritual matters), but in another respect royalty is to be praised (that is, in respect of political matters). But polity is, as the philosopher Aristotle teaches in lib. iii. of his Polities, the order of the city or state; whence Plato, his master, said in his Laws about the country of Attica, that it was a city with a polity constituted for the common weal, &c.; a state governing itself according to the form called democracy, and doing according to its ancestral custom. The most Attic Thucydides concludes: "A tyranny and a tyrant, then, are different from a king and a kingdom, which latter look to

the common good, while tyranny looks to its own interest." It suffices to say that the priesthood has a reign or royalty over the things of the church, and the empire a hierarchy over the things of the state. Hence men must with philosophy exercise the priesthood, and discipline royal science with priesthood, as Synesius of Cyrene desires. And Plato indeed, the Attic siren, muse, and bee, pronounced that polity happy in which a philosopher was king, or the king was a philosopher. But Philo Judæus was such a very great Platonist that it was doubted which was which, and men said, "Either Philo platonises, or Plato philonises." Even so, I swear by the truth, our most excellent emperor Kyr Kyr Alexis Michaelovich—let flattery go to the ravens, let the adulation of flatterers, who, like ravens, pick out the intellectual eyes, depart—has shown himself *so knowing in the affairs of the Church, that one would think he had been all his life a bishop*, and had been trained to be a hierophant from his earliest childhood within the sanctuary, like Samuel. And after this are they not ashamed to mention with blame that we kiss the *magnificent* hand of this most great and pious monarch? Yes, indeed! yes, indeed! I do both kiss and embrace the hand *which enriches strangers*, which tends the orphans, which leads the blind, which supports the maimed, which leads into the right way the wandering. Yes, yes! I kiss the hand anointed with the fragrant chrism of gospel grace; which is sealed with the earnest of the all-holy Spirit; which writes beautifully the salutary commandments, *which supplies our external and internal wants*, which bountifully lavishes what exceeds all necessity or want. Yes! yes! I kiss that most warlike hand, most fit to command armies, and armed with the arms of righteousness, to speak with Paul, on the right hand and on the left; which contends for the orthodox faith, which is adorned with the manifold colours of goodness, which is gilt with the virtues, which is crowned with the graces, and clothed with heavenly beauties and diadems. And thou indeed, O emperor honoured of God, Alexis, and thyself [like thy patron] truly a man of God, withdrawest, instead of holding out, thy hand to us bishops: but we, of ourselves, even violently snatch it to us, as the anointed hand, the hand most merciful to all, of our anointed sovereign. In old time Ptolemy surnamed Philadelphus put an inscription over his immense library, calling it a Dispensary for souls. But

much more happily our *philadelphian* sovereign (that is, most charitable, most affectionate to the brethren, and to his own sisters) Alexis is wont to call his hospital for the infirm and sick a living library; and very appropriately, as the examples of his charity, being seen as in that library itself, are open for us to examine, though we do not so much read in those books as contemplate and admire the treasures of love for the poor which are secure from depredation in this world and laid up safely in store for the world to come. But one of the most learned Cretans, at once in jest and in earnest, replied: "If you will prove me for one to be a liar, I will confess that you speak truth." But why do ye mock my words, O fellow-ministers (for I claim to myself your brotherhood)? Evil is in everything, on all sides interwoven and conflicting with all the virtues. It is not possible to make now a new separate city for the bad (πονηρόπολις), as Philip of Macedon once, according to the historian Theopompus of Scio, did, collecting all the bad together from on all sides; but the bad live together with the good in one society. The Church of Christ is called holy, though she is blackened by them that are defiled and polluted, and marked with the spots of sins like the leopard. We deny not that there are many who walk not in the steps [of Christ and the apostles], who foot it not aright, nor rightly divide [the word of truth]. But, still, to conclude from some to the whole body is unphilosophical and inconsequent. For the scope of an induction extends not only to a few, or to some, but to all everywhere. For it does not follow that if the Cyclops have only one eye, therefore all men are one-eyed. Nor if *two or three of the boyars are irreligious*, and *insult what belongs to the episcopate*, are all of them therefore at once to be set down as insubordinate and as transgressors. Let us not listen to such a calumny! to use the words of Simeon of Thessalonica. As for those malignants (Telchins), who, because they are agitated by innovating envy, say that the emperor creates the patriarch, they say *what is not true*. For it is *by no means the emperor*, but the synod, which acts, the emperor *only ministering* in it (ἐνυπηρετουμένου), being orthodox and religious, as has been shown, not only because he is the Church's protector and avenger (or advocate, ἔκδικος), and anointed king in the face of the Church, but also in order that he may coöperate and minister, and cherish (στέργῃ), and keep firm the things

[institutions, doctrine, discipline, ritual, privileges, and property] of the Church, needing himself also to be kept among the orthodox for the sake of the peace of the Church. He then that is elected, making the proper profession, and having accepted the church (*ἀπολογουμένου γοῦν καὶ τοῦ ὑποψηφίου εἰκότα*), all the bishops come to him [the emperor], and do him reverence. But though I have already said the same thing often, I will not shrink from saying it once again [quoting seven Greek lines]:

"The eye, which sees other things, sees not itself. Thou art taught to write for the most part by examples of writing. The writer of the gospel teaches this to them that are ensamples, to us, I say, of the sanctuary; that their eye be not filled with darkness, lest we should also exhibit ourselves as chiefs of evil. For if the *light* be *such*, how great is that darkness!"

'Art not thou, then, the man who reasons amiss, if thou either castest off for once and for ever Simeon of Thessalonica, or else receivest and admittest all his interpretations? For he maintains that the imperial eagle (on which the bishop elect is made to stand, offering in writing and reading aloud the most beautiful and the first of all lessons of learning, viz. the Creed), is significant of support, not of contempt. For if this imperial emblem were an expression and symbol of contempt, this very same thing in the labarum would not have been reverenced by the Roman soldiers, nor studded with pearls and countless jewels. Neither would the Cesars be likely to endure without indignation to see their own power trampled under foot and insulted. For every insult and dishonour offered to any of the insignia of the emperor passes, according to the word of Julius Cesar, and is referred, to the emperor himself. For if he who coins base money is said to strike the emperor in the face [and is punished], how much more shall he who ignominiously tramples on the most majestic symbol of the autocrat be condemned, instead of being regarded as altogether blameless! In old time the Roman general Marius set up the eagle as a trophy of victory in his triumph over Jugurtha king of Numidia. Whereupon also Sylla his antagonist, competing with him, and at the same time to defend and revenge himself, slew 9000 Romans of Marius' party (*πρὸς γὰρ τὸν ἔχονθ' ὁ φθόνος ἕρπει*, according to Sophocles). It is not, then, for dishonour but for honour that the eagle is spread under the feet of him who is to be ordained bishop. Wherefore

also he stands erect, pronouncing aloud the most sacred Creed into which we have been baptised, all but telling us, in so many words, that he will be constant, firm, and *a lover of Rome*, [loyal] in the faith of the emperor, and also *disposed to follow the sovereign in all things, as a good and obedient subject*. This imperial eagle, then, is a support: wherefore he stands upon the very king of birds, and is supported, while he also promises at the same time to bear up his eaglets on high, to gaze without blenching on the blazing sun of righteousness.

'Ye "*fear for the future;*" lest, that is, some future sovereign, *having a strong will of his own, being at once his own absolute judge and legislator (his own measure of justice and law), enslave the Russian Church*. There is *no chance* of this! there is *no chance* of this! This *will never be!* This *will never be!* From a *good* emperor that son who shall succeed him will be *still better*. The bad raven lays a bad egg: but from the noble eagle noble will be also the eaglet. There will not be a Saul who slew eighty-five priests wearing an ephod. Nor shall he imitate Solomon, who made Zadok priest, thrusting out Abiathar. For the name Alexis [the name of the tsarevich, then the heir-apparent] means helper or defender. Therefore he shall be rather your guardian, and the defender of the ecclesiastical administration of the Church, and your protector and maintainer and champion. He will not be a tyrant or an *αἰσυμνήτης* (a mob-ruler), possessed of tyrannical power instead of virtue. He has the succession of empire from his fathers, the plenitude of sovereignty according to an *everlasting race* (*κατὰ γένος ἀΐδιον*), *despotic* both by right of blood and by the laws. *He shall be however priest and king, having a mixed origin*' [alluding to their ancestor the patriarch Philaret Nikitich]; '*like Aristobulus*, who was at once high-priest and king, and wore the diadem; *as also Christ, the Messiah*, after the flesh is traced from a mixed descent both high-priestly and royal. He shall be proclaimed a new Constantine, *emperor at once and bishop*, as we say of the most christian and most great Constantine, to his praise, that he was, in the great vespers. And the same is witnessed by the historian Eusebius to have been such a *priest and king*. For the emperors of the Romans, like the kings of Egypt, held conjoined the power of the priesthood and the sovereignty, as sings also the Latin Homer, that is Virgil, "Rex Anius, rex idem hominum, Phœbique sacerdos."

But I have lengthened, in spite of myself, my discourse, *which I could wish were to be spoken in the ears of all.* But still I have learned that it is a good thing to conceal the secret of the king, and not to publish the things that are said and done secretly. Wherefore also, embracing calm silence, I here end this my *secret* speech in answer.'

Chap. XII. *Decision of the Synod respecting the question mentioned above as laid before it.*

These things having been thus done and looked into, and it being now daylight, and the sun having risen above the horizon, all the bishops came together, not knowing what had taken place during the night. And when they had taken their seats, they were asked by the two most blessed patriarchs if they had anything in common to offer to the synod, and any gift of words or arguments to bring forward into the midst. The bishops answered: 'By the good pleasure of God and your blessing, O most blessed patriarchs, we are not destitute, but have great abundance of such.

'It is to be known that the four œcumenical patriarchs in time past made with great wisdom this distinction, that in *political* matters the king or emperor has the prœminence. For we have found in the Nomocanon (Νομίμῳ) of the patriarch of Alexandria the first cause and occasion by reason of which this constitution was made. Is it your pleasure that this codex be produced?' 'Let it be brought in,' said the most holy patriarchs. So it was brought in; and the following words were read from it:

'In the reign of Constantine Porphyrogenitus a constitution was made and published with the participation of the then patriarch Alexius and the synod, anathematising such as attempted to make revolt or set up a tyranny against emperors, as so inciting subjects to rise against their proper masters. It ran thus: "To them that at any future time shall attempt to make any plot or civil confusion, anathema! To all that shall aid and abet them, or take part in their insurrection, anathema! To all that consult together and instigate others to such measures, anathema! To all that go out with them into the field, anathema! To any that receive them to penance, without their having repented of their insurrection, anathema!" Likewise in the reign of Manuel Comnenus, that emperor, with the civil dignitaries and the then

patriarch and the synod over which he presided, anathematised them that were minded to make a plot or insurrection against his son Alexius, and their accomplices. Another act of just the same kind was by the emperor Alexius Palæologus prepared to be issued in regard to his son the emperor Andronicus Pius, on which occasion also the great dignitaries were present, and the patriarch Joseph (who for his adherence to true orthodoxy obtained the crown of confessorship), together with the synod of the bishops under him: and they subjected to an anathema and to the most fearful imprecations all who should plot any treason or insurrection to drive from the throne the pillar of orthodoxy, the divine emperor Alexius.'

The metropolitan of Gaza rose and said with reference to this distinction: 'There is a law of Julius Cesar which defines who is properly a traitor (ἀποστάτης) and a rebel (ἀντάρτης); and this determines that he who organises or joins a faction against the emperor, and plots against him, *or against the senate*, or devises a plot, or, knowing of any one, does not immediately give information of it, or who thinks that he has knowledge, and does not give information, is and is to be called a traitor and rebel, even as if he joined the barbarians. Wherefore also Miltiades, the Athenian general, was condemned as a traitor because, having taken the fleet to the isle of Paros, he departed, and returned to the golden Athens without doing anything: for which he was suspected of having taken a bribe, when he might have taken the island if he would. Likewise the tyrant who rises up against his lawful emperor or king is named a rebel. And so every traitor and rebel is rightly subjected to anathema. For though Chrysostom says that we ought not to anathematise any Christian man while he still lives on earth, and may repent, still temporarily to separate the traitor is not improper; and to deliver him to Satan for the warning and correction of others is competent for us to do, according to the teaching of Paul, who was caught up to the third heaven (1 Cor. v.), even as we do with one who denies God. For as, says the œcumenical patriarch [*i. e.* the patriarch of C.P.] Kyr Michael, he is cut-off from the community of the orthodox who has denied the faith respecting God, so also, in the same way, he who has broken his oath to the imperial power, and is treacherously and dishonestly minded towards it, seems to us unworthy to be called

after the name of Christ. Christ himself, the anointed of the Lord, who has the crown of empire and the diadem, says: "Touch not my anointed [lit. my christs], and do my prophets no harm." And Saul is called the anointed [the christ] of the Lord, who was also reckoned among the prophets on account of the anointing. On this account David was angered against the Amalekite who said that he had slain the same Saul; and he said (2 Kings i.): "How wast thou not afraid to lift up thine hand to slay the Lord's anointed?" And thereupon he commanded that he should be slain by the sword, that he might have a recompense in kind, saying: "Thy blood be on thine own head, because thou saidst: I have slain the anointed of the Lord."'

The patriarchs here said: 'Can ye confirm this from our laws and codices? For the wise and admirable Solomon says in his Proverbs: My son, drink waters out of thine own vessels, and let thy running water be poured out from the fountain of thine own cistern.' Hereupon there was immediately produced and read a passage from Matthew Blastar (tit. lxxx. c. 21), '*Of traitors.*' 'He who provokes enemies, or betrays to enemies Romans, is punished capitally. But they who by land or sea have joined with robbers or pirates are punished more severely than open enemies, inasmuch as secret treachery is worse to deal with than open war. Such as from the Romans abscond to their enemies may lawfully, and without danger of being called in question, be slain as enemies. He who has plotted or schemed against the safety of the emperor, or the state, is put to death, and his property is confiscated. They who desert to the enemy, and make known our counsels, are strangled or burned.' There was read also the chapter on conspiracies, or such as make factions and seditions: 'A conspiracy is, when any persons take counsel against any others, and bind themselves by oaths to one another not to desist from their plan till it be accomplished; as in the Acts St. Luke relates that certain of the Jews made a conspiracy, and bound themselves by a curse, neither to eat nor drink till they had killed Paul. A faction is properly a knot of relations or of other persons united together; but here it denotes an evil design, and conspiracy of some people for evil deeds. But the word τυρεύειν means to concoct or devise things hard and bad, as it is written: "Their heart ἐτυρώθη," instead of ἐσκληρύνθη [was hardened]. He who organises a conspiracy

against the government, or who devises evil against the army, or betrays it to the enemies, or who by any treachery prevents the enemy from being conquered or subjected to the Romans, or procures them aid of men, arms, or money, or in any other way, falls under the charge of treason (*καθοσιώσεως*). Also the assembling of any concourse without the sovereign's command is a great crime according to the laws. A Novell of the emperor Constantine Porphyrogenitus, published with the cognisance of the patriarch Alexius and the synod, subjects to anathema such as shall either make plots or riots, with all who shall aid and abet or advise with any such persons, or suggest and recommend such courses, and all who go out with them to fight, or receive them to penance, without their first repenting of their treason, and desisting from it.' There was read also from the Military Laws of Rufus the following passage: 'He who offends against the emperor is put to death, and his property is confiscated; and his memory is condemned even after his death.' And, farther, on law iii. there is this constitution: 'If any dare to make any conspiracy or faction or sedition against their proper commander, on any pretext whatsoever, they shall incur capital punishment; and then, especially, they that are the causes, and the originators or leaders of the conspiracy. In like manner, if any one of the commanders of divisions (*τάγματος*) dare to oppose his superior commander, that is, the count, or the tribune, he shall be punished capitally. For all insubordination against the dux or commander of the soldiers incurs capital punishment. And if this is the law as regards commanders and great dignitaries, how much more as regards kings and emperors?' Likewise in law xvi. respecting any mutiny of the soldiers: 'If any one kindle or excite a mutiny (*τραχῖαν*) of the soldiers, he is punished capitally. But when many soldiers all together conspire for any unlawful end, and any legion is rendered weak and disaffected by them, they are commonly disbanded.'

A legion is a *select* body of men, 6000 strong, according to Suidas; while according to *others* a legion contains 897 [893] persons, that is, if we sum up the values of the letters of which this word λεγεὼν is composed. According to analogy, however, to speak with Theophylact, the man that does the actions of devils has within himself so many devils; and he is not clothed with the robe that he received in his baptism, nor abides in the

house, that is, in the Church, because he is not worthy to enter it, but in the tombs, that is, in the receptacles of dead works. For these are the tombs of vice and the remembrancers of eternal punishment, not to say prison-houses (*δικαιωτήρια*). In very truth every rebel[11] and insubordinate transgressor is like to a man possessed of a devil, and a son of perdition; whereas he who with confidence and boldness grounds himself on his own engagement and oath, and is not like a reed shaken by the wind, is called faithful, who exhibits by deeds his inward purpose. The plotter, then, and the rebel is at once faithless and of little faith, for he exhibits not the due faithfulness in his deeds, but knocking, in a manner, his own promise as an earthen pitcher against a brass kettle (to quote Solomon's words), he breaks it altogether in pieces. For this cause such a trampler on the cross is rightly to be accounted of as a heathen and a publican, inasmuch as he has broken his own faith and the engagement given by him to the most excellent emperor. What then? He who has trodden under foot the cross of the Lord, and so denied him, is he justly subjected to the punishment of anathema, think you, or unjustly, though he has first of his own will bound himself by his own curse?'

The Russian bishops said: 'We know that heretics are anathematised, as on the first Sunday in Lent. But as for plotters and rebels, that they should be smitten with the thunderbolt of anathema, we have never yet known; nor have we read of such a thing. For we remember the words of the patriarch Tarasius, who said in his Apologeticon: "The anathema is a fearful thing; for it casts a man far from God, and expels him from the kingdom of heaven, and sends him even to outer darkness."'

'And do ye not remember,' said the metropolitan of Gaza, 'how ye have only just now heard that traitors were struck with an anathema in time past by the patriarch Michael, with the concurrence of the holy synod of the bishops who were then present in the capital with him?'

'Yes,' they replied; 'but whether this can so be done according to the laws of the Church, we are altogether unaware; and therefore we desire some ancient testimony, so that we may learn it more clearly.'

[11] What, then, of Stephen, who in 1653 plotted against Vasili bey of Moldavia, and of his emissaries, through whom he intrigued with Matthi bey of Wallachia, and with the crûl of Hungary? See the *Replies of Nicon*, p. 46.

'Well, then,' said the metropolitan of Gaza, 'have you not a sufficient witness in the most famous apostle Paul, who, at the end of his first epistle to the Corinthians, sets as a seal or conclusion to his own epistle these words: "If any one love not the Lord Jesus Christ, let him be anathema, maranatha;" where the sweet Ecumenius adds these words in comment: "By one word he terrified all; that is, all the fornicators, all them that caused their brethren to offend by eating things offered to idols, all them that disbelieved the resurrection, and the like: for they that do such evil actions love not the Lord Jesus Christ:" "Maranatha," that is, the Lord has come.'

'How?' said the Russian bishops. 'For Nicon said differently, and taught that "anathema" and "maranatha" were the same.'

'What blundering and excessive stupidity in the man!' exclaimed the metropolitan of Gaza. 'Maranatha, Ecumenius says, is a Syriac word signifying, "the Lord has come." The apostle therefore inserted the word to signify that he not only eschewed privacy (*τὴν ἰδιωτείαν ἀποστρέφεται*), but also assumed great dignity, at the same time giving them a tap, and taking down the superciliousness of some Corinthians, who at that time prided themselves on their eloquence, and teaching them that they needed not learning but piety.'

The bishops said: 'From this text what dost thou seek to conclude?'

The metropolitan of Gaza replied: 'That whoever loves not the emperor, loves not either the Lord Jesus Christ. And this I say not of myself, but the mouthpiece of the apostles, who was pronounced blessed by our Saviour in these words, "Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-Jonah!" thus speaks in his first catholic epistle: "Fear God; honour the king!" Behold! behold! After the heavenly God he subjoins *the earthly*,[12] the most serene and god-crowned king. Therefore, whoever honours not the king, and does not with all honesty and good report (*πανευκλέως*) reverence him, the same does not either honour or reverence the most high God. Does it not then follow, by parallelism of inference, that whoso dishonours the king, dishonours also God? according to the Lord's own unerring words in St. Luke: "He that heareth you heareth me, and he that

[12] See the *Replies of Nicon*, p. 105, 401.

despiseth you despiseth me; and he that despiseth me despiseth him that sent me;" that is, God and my Father, as the dishonour rests not with you, but runs up to Him who is dishonoured. So too, then, the dishonour shown to the king is referred, and passes, and runs up straight even to God himself, the supreme lord and king of kings. Instruction concordant and twin with this the divine herald Paul also ceases not to inculcate in his first epistle to Timothy: "Let as many as are under the yoke, being slaves, esteem their own masters worthy of all honour, that the name of God and the doctrine be not evil spoken of;" that is, among the Gentiles, who marked goodness (*χρηστότητα*) even in the name of Christ [writing it *Χρηστὸς*, Chrestus]. For the gospel does not teach defection from allegiance, nor disobedience, but rather loyalty and ready obedience. Wherefore in the epistle to the Romans he says: "Let every soul be subject to the higher powers; for there is no power but of God. Wherefore it is necessary to be in subjection, not only for wrath but also for conscience's sake." "What sayest thou, O Paul?" cries Ecumenius: "is every ruler instituted by God?" "Yes, verily," answers the most profound theologian Augustine: "God, who gave empire to the Assyrians and to the Persians, made the Roman emperors also to be emperors. He who set up Caius Cesar, set up also Nero. He who made Vespasian to reign made Domitian to reign also. He who made Constantine emperor made also Julian to be emperor." On this account Athenagoras also, in his Apology for the Christians to M. Aurelius and his son Commodus, said: "To the father and son all is subject, because they have received the empire from on high." For the heart of the king is in the hand of God, according to the word of the prophet. And elsewhere, the same Solomon has said: "The souls of the just are in the hand of God." From which text it is manifest that the absolute monarch (*ὁ παντάναξ*) *does all whatsoever he does not without God*, but that he is also guarded by God, and his godlike heart is kept in goodness (*ἀγαθομένη*) of God, and receiving the divine afflatus from on high, is made bright with the heavenly light, radiating most brilliantly for the soul-saving governance, that is, of the Christian people. Hence the local bishop is bound to pray for the health and safety of our heaven-guarded emperor, as may be seen more plainly in the divine liturgies. And the same is more strikingly attested

by Justin, the philosopher and martyr, in his Apology for the Christians: "To you [the emperors] in all other things we are subjects and servants, but we worship God only." For, as Athenagoras has observed, in his time the Christians prayed for the emperor as having received from God the helm of the empire; and farther, for the emperor's son, as being to receive by succession from his father the same empire; also for the army and allies of the emperor they prayed and besought God, as we are assured by my patriarch of Jerusalem, Cyril (Cat. v.). For this cause the Persian Artabanus said, that of all the laws of the Persians, which were many and most excellent, this one deserved to be held *as the very best of all*, that they honoured their king, *and adored him as an image of the all-preserving God.* But why do I omit to instance what is done daily in *this* illustrious capital of Moscow, where mention is made [in all the divine offices] of the emperor, of the empress, and the princesses [the emperor's sisters, besides his sons and daughters], and this in obedience to most ancient tradition. For canon lxix. of the Sixth[13] council in Trullo says: "It shall not be lawful for any lay person whatsoever to enter within the holy sanctuary, the emperor's majesty and lordship [however] being by no means prohibited, but whenever he may wish to offer gifts to his Creator, according to a certain most ancient tradition, he may enter the sanctuary." For at the time of the great introit, when the cherubic hymn was beginning to be sung, the emperor alone was used to enter into the sanctuary, to offer his own honourable oblations for supplication; and from them the chief celebrant took particles, mentioning, in the first place, the name of the emperor, and so in order all the subordinate members of the imperial family. The cause of this may be most easily seen from disc. xx. of St. Gregory of Nazianzum, who there addresses to Basil the Great the following words: "But when it was time [for him] to bring the gifts to the divine table, which he did himself, no one of those who were accustomed taking part with him" (as Valens could not tell whether Basil the Great, who was then the bishop, would receive the gifts in consequence of the emperor's menaces), "at that moment he was perceived to be suffering from vertigo; for the emperor's face turned black all over; and, had not one of the clerks within the βῆμα sup-

[13] So called, but really held ten years later, and not of œcumenical authority.

ported him with his hand and prevented it, he would have fallen to the ground." From this offering of the gifts so practised at the great introit it was that the public naming and proclamation and commemoration of the emperors began originally to be made by the bishop, who cried aloud: (*Μνησθείη* &c.) "May the Lord God remember our most religious and Christian emperor," &c., while he held the gifts in his hands. And if it is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God, as he judges strictly and punishes severely (as appears also in the first man Adam, who, in the day that he was created, was expelled from the paradise of delight), it is also no less truly a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the king or emperor. For, as the Preacher teaches: "Keep the king's commandment, and about the words of an oath of God be not hasty: for thou shalt go out of his sight. Stand not in an evil word: for whatsoever he willeth he will also do." And in the Proverbs: "The threat of a king," he says, "is like the roaring of a lion;[11] whoso provoketh him to anger sinneth against his own soul." Who was more royal than Romulus, who created to himself a new and great people, and divided all his state into thirty centuries? and yet he slew his brother. Who was stronger than Abimelech, who cruelly slew his seventy brethren in one day? Who was wiser than Solomon, who, on his first accession, began his reign by shedding the blood of his brother Adonijah? And yet all these, of love for themselves and their power, put to death their own brothers. Who was more cruel than Nero the hardhearted, who even burned the mighty city of Rome by night, that he might witness a representation of the burning of Troy; who spared not even his own mother Agrippina, when he would curiously search into his own conception; who even insulted the reputed goddess of the Syrians with his urine? And yet even for him, who was such a monstrous tyrant, the princes of the apostles taught Christians to pray as for the vicegerent of the most high God, sending abroad the divinely-oracular voice "because *kings are from Jove*" (*ἐκ γὰρ Διὸς βασιλῆες*). Wherefore also they are said to be *διοτρεφεῖς* ("nourished or maintained by Jove"). To give examples: Minos, who said that he had conversed with Jupiter. In like manner Numa also gave out that he had in-

[11] Compare the *Replies of Nicon*, p. 132.

terviews with the nymph Egeria; and Scipio, that he dwelt together with Jupiter Capitolinus; and Sertorius, that he had colloquies with a hind; and Mahomet, with a pigeon. What is more, for the benefits conferred by them, for the invention or communication of sciences and arts, many kings have been named gods; as the celebrated pope and patriarch of Alexandria Athanasius, when attacking the Hellenists and idolaters, relates at length. "Perhaps," he says, "they will betake themselves to this argument, and utter big words about the utility of their inventions to human society; saying that for this cause also they have been accounted gods, because they conferred benefits on men. For Jupiter is said to have given them the art of moulding, Neptune that of navigation, Vulcan that of working in metals, Minerva that of spinning and weaving, Apollo that of music, Diana that of hunting, and Vesta that of making clothing, Ceres that of agriculture, &c. &c., as in their accounts of them they have related." But if for these and like causes the king is deified, then certainly thou also, *O godlike emperor*, Alexis Michaelovich, *hast a right to the same title*, as having caused deserts to be inhabited and cultivated with new plants and trees. Thou hast made the plains to produce wine, and the villages figs, the plains to be planted with hazels, the orchards and gardens to be adorned with many-coloured flowers, emulating the stars; who cuttest the dry land into streams of water, into tanks and pools and artificial aqueducts; not to loss and hurt, like Xerxes the celebrated Persian king, attempting madly to change the elements, to dig through Athos, or to bridge the sea with its raging waves; but for the common good of all thou *hast made all things new*, and hast made Moscow (which was old) to be almost a new city. What do ye say, O ye patriarchs? That ye are persuaded by what I have said, or that ye desire still to hear other testimonies?'

All answered unanimously: 'What has been already said *is even more than enough*.' 'Therefore,' said their beatitudes, 'let this be the conclusion and result of the discussion, that the king or emperor has the preëminence in *political* matters, and the patriarch in *ecclesiastical*; that so the harmony of the ecclesiastical constitution may be the better preserved in its integrity and uninfringed upon, and may so abide for ever and ever.'

All applauded, and exclaimed aloud: 'This is the judgment

of us all. Long life to our victorious and invincible emperor! And many years of life and health to you also, O most holy and most blessed patriarchs!'

CHAP. XIII. *How the two Bishops were summoned before the Synod, and suspended.*

The two bishops repented, though too late, according to the proverb, and subscribed separately the deposition of Nicon, with all the details and circumstances of the [patriarchal] tomes (*περιφράσεσι τῶν τόμων καὶ περιστάσεσιν*). But no one gave them any thanks for that their 'peccavi,' which was *not honest and religious, but of time-serving and men-pleasing*, to cover their own inward retention of their *sophistical ideas*. For all that they were summoned, and put to shame publicly.

Therefore, on Jan. 24th, towards sunset, we all assembled in the apartments of the patriarch of Alexandria Kyr Paisius (*on account of his said fall, and the hurt done to his leg*); and there were laid for resolution before the patriarchs three questions of no light moment. The first was this: 'How is he to be punished (or disciplined) who shall dishonour by contumacy a patriarchal synod, and that a large one and complete?' The second was: 'If any one shall show disrespect to two patriarchs, and that not in their absence but to their face, making no account of them nor obeying them, one may say, *like the old Megarians*, and that though they have seen them with their own eyes subscribing in the presence of all?' The third question was 'Of him who in the most distinct and practical way shall be *disobedient*, and *refuse to trust* a most christian emperor who *owns* the Church to be his *mother*, and *is zealous to glorify her as superior to all supremacy* and *beyond the sphere of all* [secular] *power*,—how is such an one to be punished (*κανονίζεσθαι, i. e.* with what *canonical* punishment is he to be disciplined)?'

We all answered synodically with one consent that such persons are to be corrected by ecclesiastical penalties; because the judgment and decision of the patriarchs *can no longer be called in question*, nor proposed afresh for reëxamination. And *especially if all the four be consentient, they supersede* (*ὑπερνικῶσιν, i.e.* leave no room for) *any other judgment* (*διάγνωσιν*), *no other higher tribunal existing on earth.*

After these questions then, and some other similar discussions,

the two most holy patriarchs sent for the refractory and guilty bishops, that they should come at once to the synod: and they after a brief space accordingly came, *running up* as if to kiss the hand of the patriarchs in the usual way; but they were immediately forbidden, and were not vouchsafed the usual prayer and blessing. They were *all* then (the other bishops being seated in order) asked 'why they, *who seemed to be pillars* and *of more understanding than the rest*, and at the same time *of more practical ability and energy*, had shown themselves thus *disobedient* and thus *obstinate?*'

They began to excuse themselves (excusantes excusationes in peccatis), but they laboured in vain, and uttered nonsense which helped them nothing. They said however, among other things, that they had been deceived *by the faulty translation of Paisius of Gaza*, who had rendered incorrectly[15] that passage in the tomes in which it was laid down that the patriarch is *subject* [to the emperor] in *political* matters *only*, answering herein ignorantly and not intelligently. For the metropolitan of Gaza is not an imperial translator, but of his own voluntary zeal he translates and interprets; and he translates *not directly*, but *intermediately, through the Latin tongue*, from the Greek. *Wherefore* also he has made no fault in translating *if*[16] the Russian translators *have* in places failed to represent and interpret accurately what was being translated. For such interpreters generally leave out here and there *words which are of importance*, as not knowing how to render exactly into another tongue expressions which have not their exact equivalents. Wherefore also they are not true channels for conveying and communicating the sense, *but rather betrayers and damagers of it.*[17]

They farther found fault, and added this as one of their difficulties, and indeed as 'a thing monstrous, that in the aforerecited confession given in by the patriarch Kyr Michael to the emperor Kyr Manuel there are contained these words: "I acknowledge that I am at the disposal and will and command of thy dominion, as against every man who opposes this my present oath." And not only does he address this oath in writing to the

[15] Inadequately, making it even more decisive in favour of the temporal power than it was in the original.

[16] Translating, however, from *his* Latin version of the Greek.

[17] So they were put to penance for finding out and objecting to this mistranslation, and without farther examination or judgment.

emperor, but also to the empress, and to their imperial children, and even to the princesses, and to their future husbands; which is not only very grovelling and mean and unbecoming, but also unworthy of the patriarchal authority and out of place, because thus the patriarchal eminence and dignity is very much degraded. For if a bishop and any common priest is forbidden to swear, how shall an œcumenical patriarch swear and bind himself by an oath? It seems to be impossible: for an oath is, as they know who are initiated, a confirmation of something which is made credible and which is secured through a sacred testimony. For the disgraceful saying of Euripides,[18] "my tongue swore, but my mind is unsworn," is altogether impious. For the taking of an oath is an act of the mind through which the true God is adduced in witness for the negation or confirmation of any matter, having for its end and object to preclude falsehood.'

To this *the synod* replied: 'Three things are required to an oath, that truth may be confirmed by it, viz. justice, honesty, and a good cause. For without these three it is to be considered unlawful, false, and foolish. . . . The oath of Herod was, *as Theophylact says*, unlawful and impious, or rather senseless; and, as if fearing his oath, he slays a righteous man, when he should rather in that instance have foresworn himself than commit such an atrocity. . . . Wherefore also the Church sings: "for it is a weightier matter to make an oath than to keep it." Indeed swearing was forbidden, and is forbidden, for the sake of caution. Wherefore the ancients and the Greeks, *as Demosthenes*, sware by inanimate things, by the groves, by the streams, &c., to avoid irreverence. And *Theocritus:* "No! not by the earth." And *Orpheus:* "by heaven." . . . But we Christians are forbidden to swear at all, &c. &c. (Matt. v.), though an oath by inanimate objects is not an oath of the Lord. But as the Gentiles deified these things, they are forbidden to swear by them; as also they are forbidden idols (Ps. cxiii. 12. "The idols of the heathen," &c.). The Hagarenes swear by the head of the sultan, &c., as also did the old Egyptians [by the head of their Pharaoh], as *Synesius* attests. And in the *Iliad*, Ναὶ μὰ τόδε σκῆπτρον[19] . . . But, you will say: Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God *in vain;* therefore when it is *not* taken *in vain*, we may: and it was not

[18] Quoted, no doubt, in *Greek* by the two bishops.

[19] Then follows a dissertation on ναὶ and μὰ.

forbidden altogether by the Jewish law, &c. "And in his name thou shalt swear" (Deut. x.; with the examples of Jacob and Esau, Rahab, &c.). However, in the less perfect dispensation the oath was allowed to the Jews *economically*. The son of Sirach counsels not to swear. *Clinias the Pythagorean* paid 3000 Attic talents rather than swear that he did not owe them; for which St. Basil celebrates him in his homily to the young men. Again, you will object that Paul says, "God is my witness" (Rom. i.). And the chief Rabbi himself, who says, "Be not ye called rabbi," says, "Amen, amen, I say unto you." [Then he quotes Justin, interpreting 'Amen' to mean 'may it be.'] "The Lord sware:" "By myself have I sworn." . . . An oath therefore is not evil in itself, seeing that the Most High has used it. Even so: but we must know how to use it aright, as in the case of medicine. But enough about oaths,' said the patriarchs.

But the patriarch of Antioch, Kyr Macarius, immediately resumed, and spoke thus: 'A great thing in truth, brethren and fellow-ministers, is *obedience and submission towards superiors* (*τοὺς μείζους*): whence it is sung,[20] "Obedience is better than sacrifice and burnt-offerings." The fathers of the Thebaid once heard that the wonderful Simeon was abiding on his pillar, fixed there like a phœnix, and they believed not their ears, for they were not pleased with the thing, as seeming a novelty (he remained there 40 years); wherefore they sought to test him by this same touchstone of obedience. And they sent some to cry out to him, "O dear brother, the Egyptian fathers bid thee come down;" whereupon he came down immediately, and made a profound reverence to the brethren. But they, when they saw his obedience and perfect abnegation of self, bade him go up again.

'But ye, who have been disobedient to us the patriarchs who have been put forward to come hither on behalf [of all the four] for *your honour* and *correction*, ye have withstood us, contending against us. In truth *opposition* is *diabolical;* self-will and presumption is satanical. Ye have chosen rather to think yourselves wise than to bow your heads to *all the synod*, and submit *not to men* but to the most high God, lifting up the horn of contumacy on high, like unicorns, *only for simple vanity and for* a mere *personal partiality*' (*διὰ ψιλήν τινα ἀνθρωπαρέσκειαν, i.e.* purpose of man-pleasing).

[20] In *reproof* too of a *king*.

The patriarch of Alexandria, Paisius, took it up, and said: 'To *make a faction or party* (φατριάζειν) is a great crime; and it is absolutely forbidden by the civil laws. But much more is it necessary that this sin of making *conspiracy* should be forbidden within the Church of Christ. And by canon xviii. of the Fourth œcumenical council of Chalcedon, *if any clerks or monks are found* to lift themselves up and *to make a faction* or concoct intrigues *against their bishops or fellow-clerks*, they are to be altogether degraded from their order. Ye know, my friends, that ye are *resisting not us but God, resisting the Holy Ghost* (for it hath seemed good to *us*, the œcumenical patriarchs, and *so* also to *the Holy Ghost, to depose Nicon*, who had misbehaved himself as patriarch, and had made himself a vessel not of election but of mischief and a receptacle of guile), thereby breaking the bond of *charity*, quenching the spirit of *union*, as hunters of words pursuing names and *little niceties of expression*. And now ye put yourselves forward as philologers, whereas ye understand not at all the sense of the word ὅρκος, nor its special etymological use, in which it is often used, and which is its true sense. Know, then, that when the œcumenical patriarch Kyr Michael uses the word ὅρκος, he uses it as equivalent to proof or persuasion. For as ὅρκος is from εἴργω (a restraint for restraining, that is, for forbidding all who would transgress from transgressing it), so also πίστις is derived from πείθω (proof for persuading); and thence τὸ πιστὸν is understood and used with respect to its being safe and known, affording trust and confidence to those who receive it for security and certainty, *as I* [*Paisius of Gaza*] hear also from *Theognis*, who sings and moralises: "By trust I lost my money, by trust I also saved it;" like *the Aserœan Hesiod*, who sings: "Trust and mistrust alike have ruined men." Therefore let us say that men give and receive ὅρκια [*i.e.* oaths, or, in the sense sought to be given it here, restraints]. And *Homer* sings: ὅρκια πιστὰ ταμόντες, cutting faithful oaths (or oaths of trust and surety). But ὅρκια, according to *Eustathius the scholiast*, are all things which pertain to oaths. Thence *Philostratus* calls water Διὸς ὅρκιον, that is, the thing sure and acknowledged (πιστὸν καὶ ὁμολογούμενον). But to *withhold trust from* (ἀπιστεῖν) a most christian *emperor* is a proof of *pusillanimity, a sign of disrespect*, not to say also *an exhibition of ignorance*. For *our* potent emperor both is and is named *holy* (ἅγιος). Nor would I have you suspect this

epithet, as if it were merely a word of flattery. For Meletius *our predecessor*, in his epistle to Theodore Ivanovich, styles him his "holy son in the spirit, and lord" (ἅγιον, καὶ δεσπότην), while *Hormisdas Pope of Rome* called the emperor "*most* holy," on account of the unction, that is, and according to the exceeding dignity of the empire, and the power which shines out upon all, and exceeds in worth, as writes Tarasius patriarch of C.P. to the anchorite and hegoumen John. Cease, then, from talking vain nonsense; cease from random gainsayings; and *bow your heads to this sacred synod*[21] and to the brotherhood, that ye may not hear that voice of reprobation: "Depart from me all ye workers of iniquity;" and also that word of loathing: "Get thou behind me, Satan."[22] For ye will hear that (but may that never be either to you or to us, O Christ our king!), and it will enter into your ears if ye persist in setting at naught the *patriarchal* decision, and in calumniating it as *inconsistent* and *interpolated* (ἀσύστατον καὶ παρέγγραπτον). For they truly *niconise*, or rather *papisticise* (παππαρίζουσιν), *who try to lessen the empire* (σμικρῦναι τὴν βασιλείαν), *and are zealous to extol on high the episcopate*' (καὶ τὴν ἀρχιεροσύνην πρὸς ὕψος ἐπᾶραι σπουδάζουσι).

Meantime the two bishops stood hanging down their heads and looking upon the ground, as being put to shame. And after a considerable space of deep silence the patriarchs said: 'Go, and remain for a time suspended from all performance of divine offices. For this penance is sufficient for you.' And so, *not without tears*, they went out from the patriarch's apartment. But *the others* [of their fellows] who were left were struck with fear at their unlooked-for punishment, and at the severity of their penance; for they had not had the least expectation that those bishops who had been more bold and free-spoken [than the rest] would be so sharply corrected and subjected to penance. But then they learned, *both they and others*, that they *now* had *heads and superiors over them*, to rule them, whereas *they had long been used to imagine that they were altogether their own masters*, and had nobody over them, through the *base* absence of Nicon, and the disorder and anarchy which were its consequences.

But now, whereas Paul the metropolitan of Kroutitz had been

[21] And to him who, if you bow them not, is able to cut them off.

[22] And what follows, 'For thou savourest not the things that be of God, but the things that be of men'?

previously the superintendent and guardian of the patriarchate, a decree was made that he should be replaced by Kyr Theodosius bishop of Archangel, who for the very short time of vacancy which still remained administered the affairs of the patriarchate well and honourably, so as to please both God and men.

After the above-mentioned two bishops had departed, the patriarchs gave out the first notice, that all were to prepare themselves and hold themselves in readiness for the *free* (*ἀνυπεύθυνον*) election of a new patriarch. 'Wherefore,' they said, 'all, and each in particular, must make earnest prayer to God for this election.' And so all departed home with alacrity, rejoicing at this happy announcement.

CHAP. XIV. *How all met in the stauropegion* [*or patriarchal monastery, i.e. the Choudoff, in the Kremlin*] *to elect a new Patriarch.*

On the morrow all met in the patriarchal stauropegion with one accord, the bishops, archimandrites, hegoumens, and all the Russian clergy, for the election of the new patriarch of Moscow and all Russia. For they had all learned, small and great, that *permission was accorded* to vote publicly and openly for whom they would. And a great crowd assembled to learn who it was to be. And in old time indeed the Athenians were curious seekers after news; but now the Russians seemed to exceed them. And after some time all that had come together, after having said the *Ἄξιον ἐστὶν κ.τ.λ.*, seated themselves, every man in his proper order. And one of the senior bishops, who excelled in the word of life and had a reputation for instruction and eloquence, rising up in the midst, spoke as follows:

'My eyes! what is this miracle? what is the sight which I see?' (*Ὀφθαλμοί, τί τὸ θαῦμα;*) . . . so the Hebrews cried out when they first saw the very sweet manna, the heavenly dew, falling in small drops. . . What more pleasant and more cheerful sight can there be for us, who desire to attain to the heavenly life, than that of seeing assembled and dwelling together in unity our brethren, adorned with the golden raiment of divine virtues, &c. &c.! To-day, of a truth, there is gladness, as of a high festival, both in heaven and earth . . . Rejoice, ye heavenly intelligences, and all ye angels of God! Jerusalem which is above, Sion which is below,—let them rejoice and be glad, because the middle wall of

separation is done away, the mist of sadness is scattered, &c., and she that has been long a widow puts off the mourning garments of her widowhood . . . Let *me*[22] parody a little the song of Isaiah. Where now, O Nicon, is thy strength? Where is the sting of thy haughtiness? "Let the *wicked* be taken away, that he see not the glory of the Lord. For I have seen, I have seen the *wicked* exalted very high, even as the cedars of Lebanon: and I passed by, and behold, he was not." Who, who was more proud, for the multitude of his villages, for the nation of his dependents, than Nicon, when he was patriarch? Who, who boasted himself more in wealth and power than Nicon the primate of all Great, Little, and White Russia? Ah, ah! he has fallen into the pit which he himself had dug for himself with his own hands, even as Lucifer, falling like lightning from heaven into the hell which he had made for himself. Nicon has perished! and *his memorial has passed away with an empty sound*, and all his glory has withered as a flower; and his towering pride has been singed and burned to ashes like a torch. O, O! how has Nicon fallen from the starry firmament of the Church! He who in the morning rose like some Lucifer or morning-star, suddenly became dark, a night-raven (*νυκτικόραξ*), a bat, or rather a night-fox,[23] doing the works of darkness, that he might not see those things which befit the day, but seeing only the things of the night, apparitions and phantasms,[24] nearly as an owl that lives by night, the spirit which sees visions having now in the night become clear-sighted (*τοῦ ὀπτικοῦ ἤδη πνεύματος ἀτενίσαντος*). "For thou didst say in thy mind, I will ascend to heaven, I will set my throne above the stars of the heaven" (that is, above the four patriarchs), "I will sit on the lofty mountains which extend to the north." But *the Most High* has put thee down from thy throne; he who is wont to put down the mighty, and to lift up from the dunghill the poor. And that measure which thou didst mete has been measured to thee again, according to a divine retribution. It *is not man* that has brought thee down, *but God* who is above; *He* has humbled thee for the multitude of thy villanies (*πανουργιῶν*), because thou didst not

[22] Paisius of Gaza here again, and everywhere.

[23] *νυκταλώπηξ*, capable of seeing only by night, but with a play upon the word *ἀλώπηξ*, which is a fox.

[24] Alluding to Nicon's dreams, one of which was in part the cause of his unexpected return to Moscow, and an account of which he wrote to the tsar.

remember thy latter end in the day of thy confidence, but wast ever thinking exceedingly proud thoughts. Righteous art Thou, O Lord, and true are thy judgments! For Nicon provoked *Thee;* yea, he provoked *Thee* very much, *oppressing* in many ways *the poor in spirit*, not considering that the *groans of the poor shall not perish for ever.* Therefore also the cup of thy bruising was magnified, and thy haughty eyebrow was brought down, and brought to trepidation: and now thou sittest in solitude, thou who wast before crowded around by the people. Bah! bah! how hast thou made shipwreck, O Nicon, and hast been most bitterly overwhelmed by the surges of calamity, not knowing how to hold the rudder of the patriarchal *trireme!* Wherefore thou art become a lamentable spectacle, as in a tragedy, to all the four quarters of the world, grasping the property *of the poor*, and *giving it to the covetous*, striving to *overcome*[25] *truth*, which is the sovereign of the universe. But we lament for thy marvellous *disobedience*, for thy obstinacy, and the hardness of thy heart, because when we all admonished thee, both by friendly letters and by brotherly addresses, *to desist from thy hard-heartedness*, thou didst not at all deign to do so, but didst slight our warning, boasting thyself overmuch in thine own vanity, not understanding that the man void of counsel is his own enemy, and that a snare for such a man are his own lips, and that he who denies his own declaration is self-condemned. Yea, yea; and with grief we shake our heads, since we have seen that lamentable day of thy deposition, *worthy of many black marks*, a day such as we had not expected to see for ever. For it was thou, thou thyself, that didst bring hither to this place at much cost, with much labour, with unbearable perils, the two most holy patriarchs, who by their joint sentence, and the concurrence of our counsel and judgment, did degrade thee utterly from the episcopate, and expel thee from the patriarchal chair as one condemned *of the gravest crimes.* We render the greatest thanks, we return unspeakable gratitude to you, the most blessed, the most wise *master-builders*, who, like Bezaleel, have fixed the new tabernacle of the venerable testimony, with the spiritual roofs of the ecclesiastical firmament, &c.; who have traversed sea and land, . . . symplegades and syrtes, . . . incurring dangers from robbers and from pirates, . . *to help our poverty, our* unspeakable necessity. In very truth they appeared as bright stars, as

[25] νικῆσαι, playing on the name of *Nicon.*

lighthouses showing us the way into port. . . . Through their help Nicon has been thrust out from the patriarchate (or rather, to speak more correctly, he thrust out himself through his own folly) and from the ecclesiastical order and hierarchy. Wherefore to-day we are met together to elect another, who shall *not* trust in the abundance of his wealth, *nor strengthen himself in the power of his might and his authority*, as Nicon glorified himself in horses and in chariots (though a horse is a vain thing to save a man, and the chariots of Pharaoh sank like stones in the deep waters). Wherefore we rejoice, and *prefer to be despised* in the house of God than to dwell in the tents of the sinners, and to tabernacle in curtains. And, behold, I see you as eagles about to fly up and to soar to the sun of righteousness . . . So we also thirst for the participation of the hope prepared for us, and seek the things that are above, like eagles flying upwards, . . . seeking spiritually to rise on the wings of humility . . . Let us flee division; let us turn away from discord; . . . let us lay aside the works of darkness, and the *profane babblings* of *loquacious* and *foolish* schismatics, who plainly go about to dissolve our spiritual brotherhood; who have also not a little disturbed this divinely-guarded city of Moscow,' &c. [Then he quotes St. Cyril, of Christ himself, both sacrifice and priest, offering and being offered, receiving and being distributed; and apostrophises Moscow thus:] 'Hail, Moscow! rejoice for being the place of such a synod of heavenly men and earthly angels, &c.; . . adorned with monasteries and churches as with pearls, and enriched with relics of martyrs! . . Rejoice ye too, O most venerable archimandrites and hegoumens, and say: "Ye that are unclean, go forth; ye that are unworthy of the bridechamber, go forth, and flee far from this divine choir (procul, O procul este, profani)!" Elect, I beseech you, a man adorned with prudence, versed in theory, honoured for his practice, of a venerable age, yet not so much venerable for years as for virtues, knowing how to rule himself, and how to govern others *with moderation*. Bear well in mind the characteristics enumerated by St. Paul, that a bishop should be sober, temperate, vigilant, fit to be ruler and head of the Russian patriarchate, showing himself in deed a *patriarch* as well as in name. Elect a man who has ordered well his life, so as to enjoy a good reputation, &c. &c. Let another take the bishopric of Nicon, he, that is, for whom it has been reserved, not to say predestinated,

from many and ancient days, as Matthias took the lot of the apostolic ministry, that is, the gift of the divine loving-kindness to men, *after Judas*, who had been numbered with the eleven; that the number may be full, and *not seem to be impaired*; that the minds of the weaker sort may be sobered by *his* miserable fall and transgression; since Nicon, from his refusing to understand and to lay to heart the examples[26] of former time, *has gone to his own place* of condemnation. But I have fatigued myself by going up a difficult ascent, to the acropolis of holy Sion, even up to the divine Jerusalem itself. For I tremble and am afraid at the ascent, as it has been to many an occasion of being precipitated down; having learned besides the first half of the verse Δεῦρ' ἀνάβηθι κάτω· καὶ γὰρ ἄνω κατέβης ("Hither ascend down; for thou didst descend up"). But may the Lord grant us to see the things that are agreeable to God, the things that are most honourable and most becoming, more clearly, either in a type, or in a glass, or in a picture. And let all the people say, Amen, so be it.'

All with one voice and synodically chose twelve godly and aged men; 'for sometimes age also is venerable, and given conveniently by God' [with a pun and a quotation, γῆρας τὸ τῆς γῆς ἐρῶν γέρας σεβάσμιον καὶ ζεόσδοτον]. Three of these were bishops, the rest archimandrites and hegoumens. Out of these again they preferred four as more eligible than the rest, and more skilled in business (πολιτικωτέρους). Lastly, it remained that three others should be voted for and selected in common, not, however, without the knowledge of our most excellent autocrat. But since the lot fell on divers persons, of whom some were bishops, but digamists [*i. e.* had already been translated once], while others had been reordained, a difference arose.

Wherefore three questions were proposed for solution to the most blessed patriarchs. The first was, whether it be lawful for a bishop to take a third see? the second, whether there can be a reordination (ἀναχειροτόνησις)? and the third, whether it is lawful that the patriarch should be chosen by lot, as was done in the choice of the apostle St. Matthias? These heads then were delivered to the patriarchs, to examine them, and to give answer. And in truth it was here according to that proverb that 'Need is the mother of abundance.' . . .

[26] Of *Judas*, and of *others*, as of Chrysostom, see p. 229, 230.

CHAP. XV. *Resolution of three preliminary questions.*

The first question was, whether a man can be made three times a bishop, seeing that ordinary marriage is allowed the second time only of condescension, and the third time is accounted a transgression, as Gregory of Nazianzum says: and Basil calls a fourth marriage *polygamy*. The emperor Leo Sapiens, marrying a fourth time, was not allowed by the patriarch Nicholas, nor blessed by the patriarch Euthymius; nay, even his third was not blessed, but was called a transgression. 'If then,' the patriarchs replied, 'the third civil marriage is scarcely allowed, how shall the spiritual be allowed a third time? Paul says a bishop is to be the husband of one wife (that is, if married at all); and some argue hence against all translations. Some object that Gregory Theologus was himself bishop three times: but this is quite false. He was forced first by the bishops, with St. Meletius at their head, to accept for a time the second bishopric; but after the death of Meletius in C.P. he resigned, and refused the third time, and settled Eulalius there instead. So they who pretend that he was bishop three times *ventriloquise, i.e.* speak merely out of their own belly.'

The second [third] question was more curious, and seemed most worthy of closer inquiry, viz. if it be lawful now to cast lots[27] in the election of bishops. For it is written, 'And the lot fell on Matthias.' The patriarchs answered: 'It is plain and well known that among the Hebrews the lots (οἱ ἔηλοι) were in use. Theodoret describes the use of the twenty-two Hebrew letters in this way, and exemplifies by *ναὶ* and *οὐκ*. Ἔηλοι were so named from a verb ἔήω [ἐηλόω?]: whence Hosea (ch. iii.) writes, 'many days without prince, sacrifice, altar, priest, or ἐήλων,'[28] which Aquila paraphrases with the word *φωτισμοὺς*, illuminations, while Suidas makes ἔήλους to be visions in sleep. Epiphanius in his book about the twelve precious stones, and especially where he treats of the ἀδαμὰς, describing the signs given by them, says that the high-priest wore them when he went into the holy of holies, thrice in the year: and Zacharias went in as high-priest: and the people saw the flashing of the stones as a good omen when he came out.

[27] Here they examine different passages in which lots are named, give them another sense, or make them out to be exceptional, and decide against the use of material lots.

[28] In the Vulgate it is 'teraphim.'

When there was an accidental opportunity, Paisius the metropolitan of Gaza was asked to give his opinion, which he did accordingly [in a long-winded discussion which follows]. 'Though Ecumenius by κλῆρον understands our λάχος or λαχμόν, speaking thus of the election of St. Matthias, "The apostles, as not being yet perfectly accomplished, recognised the worthy person by lot and not by a sign" (and he quotes the case of the mariners and Jonas), still Dionysius the Areopagite (*Eccles. Hier.* ch. vi.) explains this lot otherwise, as some divine gift indicating the man to be chosen; either a light from heaven, or a dove, &c.; . . . the rods of the chiefs of the twelve tribes, and that of Aaron; . . . the dew on the fleece of Gideon; . . . Elias knew the prophets of Baal: . . . which supernatural "lots" are *signs*, and not to the point. But the common λαχμοὶ, which distinguish according to the precious stones [of the Urim and Thummim], are heathenish: and astrology, &c. and divination by fate or fortune are proscribed. Other lots are such as, "my lots are in my hand." Such are used in things beyond the prudence of man, as to discover the theft of Achan, and the honey of Jonathan, and by Samuel to find Saul. And Augustine says: "The city being closely besieged, the lots were given to know who should go out and who stay." . . . "A lot is the end of strife." And the great ecclesiarch Sylvester Syropulus writes, that when Metrophanes metropolitan of Cyzicus was to be made patriarch of C.P. (who had before been proposed by John, the seventh of the Palaeologi), there were lots (two candidates, the metropolitans of Cyzicus and of Trebizond, having been chosen by the bishops): and the lots were placed upon the holy table: and after the great protopapas had celebrated the liturgy, he took one of them, and gave it to be carried to the emperor.'

In respect of the third [second] question there were certain preliminary discussions as to previous facts and documents relating to the œcumenical patriarch Jeremiah and Job the first-made patriarch of Moscow, and how the emperor Theodore Ivanovich received the same œcumenical patriarch. In the other Russian records and descriptions [of the ceremonies observed] there was contained also the form of the ordination performed upon the metropolitan Job, who being already metropolitan of Moscow was ordained a second time, which *to us Eastern bishops seemed not only a novelty, but absolutely heretical*,

and inserted ignorantly by the scribe, and noted falsely, being really *an interpolation. For* canon lxvii. of the Apostles *says* that there can be no second baptism nor ordination, unless these two sacraments have been administered by heretics. Note the words of the canon, '*unless*,' &c. What is *impossible cannot be done:* what is unlawful cannot be blessed, though there were ten thousand doing it and blessing it, and they bishops, priests, or patriarchs. The historian tells us that when Peter was about to be crucified, he sent for Linus and Clement, and said to them these words: 'Behold, I give to you that power, those keys of the kingdom of heaven which the Lord gave to me, that is, the power of binding and loosing, yet of binding not absolutely, but conditionally, whatever may deserve binding, and to loose whatever may be worthy of loosing.' Therefore it is not lawful to allow what is not of our competency, though they be popes or patriarchs who have done it, when the things that are allowed or done by them are transgressions and unlawful. For who shall say that it is lawful for them to murder, to commit adultery, &c.; such sins being forbidden by the decalogue? Let it therefore be laid down as a certain position, that there can be no canonical reordination nor rebaptism, because the seal of these is ineffaceable. There are three sacraments which impress a seal—baptism, chrism, and ordination: wherefore these cannot be given twice, because of the ineffaceable nature of the seal.... This may be learned still more clearly from Simeon of Thessalonica, who writes of the ordination of a patriarch thus: 'If then he is already one of the bishops, he needs not to be ordained, but only to be enthroned.... Certainly if any, having been nominally priests before, had been rebaptised, *these* would have had need to be reordained: for if their baptism, which is the foundation of all other sacraments, were not canonical [were invalid], there was no ground in them for the other sacraments to rest on, as it is impossible to build walls or to put on a roof where there is no foundation. Therefore certain of the Muscovites did very ignorantly and inconsistently who some time ago rebaptised Kozak priests [that is, Latin or uniat priests taken in war in the Kozak country or in Lithuania], but did not reordain them, but let them retain their order of priesthood. Wherefore John surnamed ὁ χαμαίτης (of the ground, *humilis*) of Scio, who was also called Κασούλας, that most eloquent preacher, reasoned

very probably from the fact that the ordination of the Latins is held sufficient (*στέρκτην*) by the Eastern Church (for no man of the Easterns until now has ventured to reordain a Latin priest), that their baptism also, and by consequence, must be held to be valid. [Then follow one or two pages about *idols* not being *icons*, because they have no real prototypes.]. . . And *so* there can be no true sacrament of orders, nor any other secondary sacrament, where there has not been previously true baptism.

I am not ignorant that John bp. of Kitros, in his first Answer to Constantine Cabasilas abp. of Dyrrhachium, doubts about the azymite priests, reordained by the Eastern bishops, whether that was done well; and answers that 'we ought to hold the unwritten custom of the Church as a law; for so teaches St. Basil the Great. Certainly then, if any such custom is also of long standing. However, in this matter we do not know for certain if it has ever been examined and approved by a synodical tribunal. For it is such old customs as have been examined in a synodical court and approved which the saints order us to regard as unquestionable; but such as are not of this kind they absolutely reject. For those things which have been synodically considered and determined are of more force and weight than those which have been ruled only by individual authorities.'

However, I think that I ought to say with confidence, that when ecclesiastical custom cries aloud, and the acts that are religiously done every day speak for themselves, we ought not by any means to run off to empty theories and sophistical contentions, which tend only to break up the peaceful state of the Church; but we should be disposed to favour the teaching which has come down from those before us, and the injunctions of our fathers, and not move those landmarks of the old fathers which they set to remain for ever. Therefore canon xlviii. of the synod of Carthage directs thus: 'And that we repeat which has been delivered to us, and which has been decreed in the synod of Capua, that it be not lawful for any second baptism to be administered, or any reordination made, or for bishops to be translated;' which canon iv. of the council of C.P. also forbids, saying that Maximus the cynic neither had been nor was a bishop, &c. For, as Gregory the presbyter of C.P. writes in his Life of St. Gregory of Nazianzum, Maximus was a native of

Egypt . . . . who opposed Gregory and John Mares . . . . he sent money to the patriarch of Alexandria, and got him to send some bishops to ordain Maximus as bishop of Byzantium, which they did in the house of a stage-piper. . .

So there can be no more reordination than rebaptism, nor removal of bishops, but only lawful translations from one see to a higher; and that for the sake of some manifest good of all; as in the case of Gregory of Nazianzum, who found only one church (that of the Resurrection) at C.P. orthodox, and left there only one Arian, ... [citing canon xiii. of Antioch, and Matt. Blastar on Translations, cap. iv.]. For so greatly did the council of Sardica loathe this offence of invasion, that it judges him who is guilty of it [*i.e.* who invades another see without appointment by a synod] to be unworthy of the Christian name, and would not have such to receive even Christian burial. But promotion is allowed; as in the time of John Vatatzes, when Germanus was patriarch, in the case of the elevation of the metropolitan of Tirnovo to be patriarch. Asan, prince of the Bulgarians, did not cross the Hellespont, but remained near Callipolis. John took Asan's wife and daughter to Lampsacus, where was the empress Irene, and they married Asan's daughter to their son, and let the wife return. And, to gratify Asan, they made the metropolitan of Tirnovo a patriarch by imperial and patriarchal decree, Asan promising also to assist them to expel the Latins.

Chap. XVI. *How Kyr Joasaph was proclaimed Patriarch of Moscow.*

We went then by command of our emperor to the council-chamber contiguous to the imperial palace (*συνόροφον*), that is, all the bishops, with only one of the patriarchs, Kyr Macarius (for the leg of Kyr Paisius was so painful that he could not walk). And we stood in order, viz. on the right side Pitirim metropolitan of Novgorod, Laurentius of Kazan, Jonah of Rostoff, Paisius of Gaza, Theodosius of Archangel, Gregory of Nicæa, Kosmas of Amasia, *Athanasius of Iconium*, Philotheus of Trebizond, Theophanes of Chios (the metropolitan of Kroutitz Paul, and the archbishop of Riazan Hilarion, as being under sentence of suspension, were not present), Ananias archbishop of Mount Sinai, Simon of Vologda, Philaret of Smolensk, Joa-

saph of Tver, Joseph of Astrachan, Arsenius of Pskoff, Manasses of Pogoniane, Alexander of Viatsk, Lazarus of Chernigoff, Methodius of Mstislaff, Joachim of Sloviansk. And, behold, our most divinely-graced emperor appeared with his most illustrious synclete, and his most splendid senate and council, shining like some Lucifer in the midst of the stars. And having received the blessing, as usual, of Kyr Macarius, and having beckoned to all the bishops to be seated, he sat down himself on his gold-covered seat, the other religious boyars and the most venerable archimandrites standing. Then was given the paper containing the names of the three persons elected by Pitirim metropolitan of Novgorod to the patriarch Macarius, who presently gave it to the emperor; and it was read publicly in the ears of all by the senator [the secretary of the council of the boyars] Almiaz [Ivanoff]. The three were the most venerable archimandrite of the Trinity Lavra Joasaph, the archimandrite of Vladimir Kyr Philaret, and the kellar of the stauropegial monastery of the thaumaturge Alexis [the Choudoff in the Kremlin] Kyr Sabbas.

After much consideration and theoretical examination, Kyr Joasaph was proclaimed patriarch of Moscow and Russia, by the bishop of the chief see Pitirim, who proclaimed thus: 'Our most serene and most potent emperor &c., and the divine and sacred great synod, invite thy most venerable sanctity to the most exalted chair of the patriarchate,' &c.

However, this patriarch-elect made many excuses, on account of his advanced age, adding, that he had neither learning nor capacity for business (neither theory nor practice). But the most serene and most prudent emperor, not without tears, with hymettian words and kind expressions sweeter than honey and the honeycomb, mollified his pain, skilfully uttering impromptu *such* a harangue as the following:

'The god-loving zeal, the godly-wise care for the peaceful state of the Catholic Church which I have inherited and made my own from my divinely-appointed ancestors, ye all well know, I think; and I consider it to be superfluous to seek other witnesses for any confirmation and recommendation of what I shall say. But the adversary Satan, the common hater of peace, the implacable enemy of Christian love, who is ever disposed to contend against me, has raised innumerable opponents, not so much

civil as spiritual, who dwell nearer or abide farther off, who cease not day by day to lift up themselves against me, and to set themselves in array against me, to speak with St. Paul, in the arms of the right hands and of the left hands of injustice and tribulation. We swear truly to you, however, by truth, which is the sovereign of all things, that no one personal foe, however noble, nor enemy, *has ever troubled me so much, so much exasperated or alarmed me*, as he who was heretofore patriarch of Moscow, Kyr Nicon, who also in truth appeared as a new plague of Egypt,[29] the first decisive and Pharaonic stroke, who undertook and carried on pertinaciously a contest neither praiseworthy nor admirable, heedless of all the good which had been shown him—and I mean not that which I showed him myself, which was as nothing, but that which was shown him from heaven most bounteously and abundantly. But he may with reason be called publicly ungrateful who, having received benefits, remembers them not. Wherefore also, since his just condemnation the Most High has recompensed to him, not in the world to come, but even already in this temporal life, his retribution and recompense, having weighed his *corrupt* actions, using an exact balance. It is not however with any pleasure, as if triumphing at his reverse, that I thus speak, but from the depth of my heart I am pained at the depth of his affliction, I am disquieted and feel a pang at his calamity, and at the unchanging obstinacy of his mind I deeply grieve, as I see him abiding *inseparable from evil*, as if it were grown into his nature, giving no opening for any glimpse of hope of repentance, or of regret, *or of that improvement which I love*. Therefore, I have cried aloud with David my royal prophet, and have said: "Do not I hate them, O Lord, *that hate Thee;* and have not I pined away at the sight of [thine enemies]? Yea, I have hated them right sore, and they have been unto me for [mine own] enemies." *Consequently* I was not able to remain indifferent when I knew, and had ever before my eyes for so many years, my mother, which bare me anew, which fed me at her breast, which nursed me, *my* holy Church, unreasonably and unlawfully widowed; but being moved *by divine zeal* I felt compelled to bestir myself *to succour her*, and to stretch out to her the hand of help, as being naturally and of right her *defender*, being styled her *ad-*

[29] A new Moses to plague Pharaoh.

vocate and her *patron;* and *by the power which I have had allotted me from above* by the favour, mercy, and grace of the Almighty, from whom, the Lord of lords, I have it that I am lord and despot (being anointed on this account also with the divine myron of the spiritual chrism and seal) to fulfil with all my mind and soul that which is written in the wisdom of king Solomon, who cries in his Proverbs (ch. xx. 8), "A good king is as a winnowing fan, scattering away the wicked;" and also to imitate and emulate the religious kings who have been before me, as David, Josiah, and Hezekiah, who contended strenuously for that religion which had been delivered to their people, and who, as the anointed of the Lord, showed themselves in deed, as they were called in word, champions and patrons of the most venerable orthodoxy. Of a truth many, according to the Psalms, have trusted in the Lord, in whom *if any other* governor *has ever put his trust,* I also am *one of the more conspicuous,* believing him that says, "The heart shall not fear that is grounded on the counsel of understanding." But *since the counsels of men are ever fallible,* and their designs very often mistaken, I was persuaded that this also is good, which is said, "*Ask thy fathers,* and they shall tell thee:" and *so I asked,* both by my letters and by my entreaties, the most holy patriarchs to visit us opportunely, and to give a hand quickly to the Russian Church, which was in the greatest danger, tossed on the surges of innovations, and driven, as they say, to the very edge of a rocky shore. And the compassionate God, the lover of men, through whom kings reign on the earth, who *foresees the future* and knows the present and the past, has brought hither of his grace, and has given to us, the two patriarchs, Kyr Paisius and Kyr Macarius [playing upon their names], men truly able to sift the exact criteria and the conspicuous dikaioteria (*κριτήρια καὶ δικαιοτήρια*) of justice which dwells with them; who, finding *our* Nicon convicted by many proofs, and enslaved by many charges, *would have corrected him and guided him spiritually,* as being already turned aside from the [*king's*] highway, and *would have calmed his soul,* and *better informed his mind* by *gentle strains,* if perchance it had been possible by *their* pastoral *rod* to bring him to *straightforwardness* and *rectitude* (*εἰς εὐθύτητα καὶ ὀρθότητα*). But we have now *missed our* right and peaceful *aim:* for the jackdaw remained a jackdaw still; the dropsical patient continued still to

run with water, refusing to receive the medicine of the needful treatment, the draughts of the proper purge. But do thou then, O Joasaph, who hast been now elected, or rather thou divinely-appointed Aaron, whose rod has blossomed and borne almonds (for I wish to address thee also), be a man, be strong, and cease to complain of thy most becoming and venerable age, as already drooping its head heavily like an ear of corn, like a palm-tree with its sweet burden[29] looking to the ground, as if in love with the earth.[30] I remember to have once read that among the Spartans who were so brave in war (who wore red, that they might not show, nor themselves so much notice, the blood when wounded by the enemy) there were three choruses; and the first was of the old men, who sang as follows: "We were once valiant youths" (*Ἄμμες ποτ' ἦμεν ἄλκιμοι νεανίαι*); the second of men, who responded *Ἄμμες δέγ' ἐσμεν, ἂν θέλῃς, ἀλκάστερος*· and the third of youths, who sang *Ἄμμες δέγ' ἐσσόμεσθα πολλῷ κρείττονες*, "but we in time shall be much better men still." But what else is strength than a certain bond of the soul to the body? Rejoice and congratulate thyself that thy raging passions have been bridled, that the irrational impulses of the wanton flesh have been withered, and the flowing and ebbing waves of the soul surging within have been broken and lulled to calm, so that thou hast become almost entirely passionless through the hoary hairs of natural old age. This thy old age shall be thy bridge and ladder to a better passage, to a greater ascent, because thou shalt also in thine old age utter that Socratic word, "I grow old ever learning." And thou hast come to hear that votive wish of the same Hesiod, "Mayest thou die old! mayest thou by old age be very happy!" (*Γηραλέος δὲ θάνοις, γήρᾳ μέγας ὄλβιος εἶης*). Thou must still farther hear this wish: "May thy old age be as that of the most wise serpent, which renews itself through an abstinence of forty days, and casts all its skin, and is transformed into a new coat of spring, to a new youth, according to the poet Nicander, who sings thus: *Ἀψ ἀναφοιτήσῃ νεαρῇ γε κεχαρμένος ἥβᾳ*. Come then, henceforth go as some spiritual stag, which drives away the venomous snakes, and hastes at full speed to the fountains and streams of the divine scriptures; and

[29] The imagery is quite as if Alexis had made the tour of the Levant in company with Paisius.

[30] Playing, as before, on the word *γῆρας*, as if from *γῆν* and *ἰρᾶν*.

drink thou the water which gushes up to everlasting life with insatiable mouth: for so also the sin that dwelleth in thee shall be killed, and the triple horn of thy life shall be renewed, extending to other years, even to fifty years. Let thy sober conscience return to the height of virtues; and may it be warmed by the warming grace of the all-holy Spirit. For so immediately shall thy youth be renewed as that of an eagle (which is thus called ἄετος for its πολυετίας, as if from αἰών), which lives for many years, and because it many times renews itself by the growing again of its feathers, according to the great Athanasius; (though Theodorus of Heraclea has said allegorically that the old age of the Hebrews who were captives at Babylon was to be renewed into a kingdom as they were before, the eagle, as being the *king* of birds, hinting this kingdom). But may thy old age blossom, sprouting and growing up, and renewing itself like the bird called the phœnix, which after 500 or 600 years being burned to ashes, is renewed with new wings and quickened, returning to life on the third day. Farther, may thy age blossom as the new shoot of the palm which sprouts up; and reaching to great length of days, may it produce lasting fruit of unfading immortality: of which may we also all be partakers through your god-persuading and god-established prayers, O most blessed *patriarchs*, and most religious bishops! And let all the people say, Amen, Amen.'

All applauded, and cried out, 'O king, live for ever! Many years to thee, thou new Constantine, thou great *Theodo*sius, thou most excellent *Justi*nian, *defend*er and valiant champion and helper of the Church! May the Lord, who strengthens rulers, strengthen thy empire! O heavenly King, preserve our earthly king, *who* has given *peace* to our Church, and has saved it from all divisions. Save all those who love the peace and concord of the Church of Christ, and who bring with them such things as are good and desirable both for soul and body!'

After these solemn words, and the civilities usual on court occasions, our most excellent emperor was blessed by Kyr Macarius; and so, shortly afterwards, the episcopal synod broke up, and every one went home with much gladness for the consolation of the election.

The ordination was to take place on the 3d of February; but out of respect for Kyr Paisius it was put off for some days, till he

should get better. So it was put off to the next Sunday, which was that of the Carnival.

But, O the goodness and providence of God! There came also the ambassadors who had been sent to the most serene Casimir krâl of Lachia [king of Poland], bringing news of the conclusion of a truce for thirteen years and six months on the first of Feb., a day therefore well given in the kalendar to *Hilarion* [playing as usual on the name, as signifying cheerfulness, joy, from *hilaris*]. . . . It is an old custom at Moscow for the ambassadors to carry about the Icon not made with hands [the Holy Face, called ἀχειροποιητὸς] in time of friendliness and peace. So the emperor with the bishops and boyars went out to meet this so holy icon about six miles: and when it had come near to the great church, Kyr Macarius with all the clergy went out to receive it; and a παράκλησις of thanksgiving was celebrated for the peace; and after it the polychronion was sung; and all went home with joy.

And, having been present on this occasion, I cannot refrain from declaring that the Church can have no peace without the empire; and if the empire is disturbed, the Church is necessarily and altogether disturbed too. But see and understand the unspeakable economy of God, which governs with care all things; so that when the Church of Christ began to be at peace, and when the *neikos* or strife (νεῖκος with a pun) of *Neicon* ceased, the middle wall also of separation was broken down. So that in truth the empire and the episcopate appear as two great and *equal* lights, and each is reciprocally illumined by the other, and is paralleled alternately, as one may say, by a certain circumvolution (ἀντιπερίστασις).

On the morning of the Presentation (ὑπαναντῆς), February 2d, the ambassador Athanasius [Naschokin] was honoured with the rank of boyar; and after the patriarchal celebration of the liturgy, being robed in splendid attire, the same Athanasius was honoured in the imperial banqueting hall, the chiefs of the senate being also seated at the banquet; and he was gratified farther with other gifts, to excite emulation in others after him to serve faithfully the potent autocrat and the common interest of the state with all their souls.

I had nearly forgotten the heads which were proposed by the emperor; but these, for brevity's sake, I will not mention now,

as men nowadays insist much on brevity, and loathe idle loquacity (*βαττολογίαν*), as wearisome. But they shall be given below, and thrown together with other questions in the *τόμος ἑνώσεως* (the Tome of Union), which shall be set forth at the end.

CHAP. XVII. *How the two suspended Bishops were called before the Synod (3d Feb.), and made their apology.*

On the Sunday of the Prodigal there was held a great synod on account of the offending bishops who had been suspended. And they were called; and after being admonished and exhorted by the patriarch, having made metánoias by prostration, they were admitted to his blessing and prayer; and being pardoned they partook of the brotherly salutation in a holy kiss. And now all was in gladness; and the mists were altogether dispersed, and the full-mooned light of peace shone, the very name of which is sweeter than the honeycomb. As Thomas's incredulity was good, as confirming many souls to believe, so if these bishops, *the most eminent of their brethren*, had not disputed about the sense of the patriarchal tomes, *the rest would not have been confirmed:* but the sight of the contentiousness of these two bishops (*τὸ ἔνστερι*) coming to nothing, and ending *in sardonic laughter* [at their utter powerlessness, produced a powerful and a salutary effect]. It remained still, however, that such offenders should kiss the hand of our emperor, and so receive perfect forgiveness of their offences (for they had greatly *wounded him the* complete king (*παντάνακτα*) by their *injurious susceptibility* and *disobedience*). So the most mild sovereign the next day came to the patriarchs to take their blessing; and those two bishops, Paul and Hilarion, were called with the rest; and having been rebuked before all, and reproached with words which went deep for their *schism*, they departed in peace, having repeated over and over again '*Peccavimus.*'

There was some whispering, however, still among their friends, *even after this*, in support of them *that had said* that the empire is exceeded by the dignity of the priesthood, because the bishop is named first in the church, and the emperor afterwards; and this is customary not only in the *συναπτὴ* of the *εἰρηνικὰ* [the petitions bidden in the public services by the deacon, and responded to by the singers and people], and in the secret prayers

of the liturgy, and in the diptychs themselves, but also in the prayer behind the ambon, in which the Church always puts first the bishops and priests and all the rest of the clergy, and then adds last the emperors, according to a certain divine law and custom given out from the beginning; because the priesthood is the source of all Christianity, which pours forth to all streams of sanctification. Thence the bishop appears more honourable than all who are sanctified by him, because the less is blessed by the greater. Nevertheless Simeon of Thessalonica, who thus speaks, witnesses in his chapter on the Matins that *among some this order had been changed*, 'and so in some sense the clergy obtain the place due to them, *in spite of their being very much tyrannised over by the laity*' (*παρὰ τῶν λαϊκῶν σφόδρα μέντοιγε καταδυναστευόμενοι*). But in truth this argument is too forced, and proves too much, as it would go to set every clerk above the emperor. . . . In the *εἰρηνικὰ*, after all the clergy *and the people*, there follows the mention of the emperor, the palace, and the army. . . . but in the dismissal (*ἀπόλυσις*) of the nocturn the emperor is put first, and the bishops afterwards: 'Let us pray for our potent and holy emperors,' &c.

'Yes, but,' they add, 'besides, the emperors are anointed by the Church, and receive from her their quality of rulers, even as the bishops, who, being anointed with the grace [of their priesthood], receive likewise their spiritual power, according to the prophetic word, Thou shalt make princes over all the earth.' Here also I will speak, and that not from myself, but from the treasury of the divine scriptures. . . . And let us see first what is written even in the Nomocanon, where it is examined with much exactness what is the power of the chrism. So, then, on canon xii. of the synod of Ancyra it says that the holy patriarch Polyeuctes first expelled from the precinct of the most holy great church of God the emperor Kyr John Tsimisces, for having slain the emperor Nicephorus Phocas, but afterwards received him: for he said with the holy synod, in the synodical act then made, and preserved in the record-office, that since the chrism of holy baptism effaces all sins of whatever kind or magnitude they be, the chrism of the empire also had by all means effaced the murder committed previously by John Tsimisces. The same argument one might extend also to the most splendid sun of all Christian kings, Constantine, who had unjustly slain, through

Fausta his wicked wife, his innocent son Crispus, the delight of the world, the second Joseph, and new Hippolytus (to whom Constantine himself afterwards set up a silver statue, 'To my injured son Crispus, Constantine his father set this up'), namely, that he received complete remission of this when he was baptised and anointed by the most divine Pope Silvester in what is called the Lateran palace (for we are not to believe the Arian Eusebius, who absurdly tells us that the most christian emperor deferred his baptism, and was baptised in the Jordan quite at the end of his life, having remained so many years uninitiated and only a catechumen). So the chrism of the empire is a great thing, and *if not above*, yet *at least of equal weight* and *equivalent*, and, to speak aristotelically, parallel and corresponding (*ἀντίστροφον*) to [that of] *the episcopate*.

One argument only still remains for us to examine, viz. that it is said of the bishop *δέσποτα ἅγιε*, 'holy despot, or lord,' which is not uttered to the anointed emperor. But this argument halts on both legs: for the emperor also is and is called *ἅγιος*, holy. So Hormisdas of Rome writes to Epiphanius of C.P., 'I was filled with joy that the most holy emperor and thy charity show care for the peace of the Church,' &c. Here is not only *ἅγιος*, but *ἁγιώτατος*; not only holy, but *most holy*. Again, in book ii. of the *Βασιλικὴ Διάταξις*, cap. v. *περὶ τῶν ἀπρακτῶν ἡμερῶν*, Balsamon has the following, 'Read the novell of our divinely-crowned emperor Kyr Manuel, son of Comnenus.' And in lib. iii. c. ii. 'Of the Translation of Bishops,' 'My most potent and holy emperor,' &c.; and in the third of the synodical decisions, in the chapter 'Of voluntary homicide,' 'Our potent and holy emperor and lord,' &c. And Simeon of Thessalonica, when treating of the election (or promotion, *προβλήσει*) of a new patriarch, writes, 'Our potent and holy lord and emperor, and the divine and holy synod, invite thy holiness to the most lofty throne of the patriarchate of C.P.;' whence it is plain that the emperor notifies not of himself, but [what is the vote] of the synod, and only ministers as the anointed of the Lord, and as having been constituted the 'defensor' (or guardian and defender) and minister of the Church when he was anointed, and as having promised so to be. And both the bishop who anoints the emperor by his proclamation proclaims him holy, and the emperor, more especially after being anointed with the unction of the chrism, is pro-

claimed holy, though in the strict and natural sense there is one only who is holy, that is God, &c.

They argued also still against the patriarchal decision made concerning the anathema published against rebels [or traitors]: for the opponents said that this was plainly contrary to St. John Chrysostom, who says that we should subject no man to anathema as long as he lives on earth, except him who is attached to heresy, and will not repent. 'What then,' he says, 'is the anathema which thou utterest but this: Let him be given over to the devil, and let him no longer have place of salvation, but let him be an alien from Christ? And who art thou who darest to do this, and anticipatest the judgment of the King? This anathema cuts off from Christ.' 'On this account,' Balsamon notes, 'the synodical tome made in the reign of Kyr Constantine Porphyrogenitus and the patriarch Kyr Alexius, to anathematise the traitors and rioters, and such as took up arms against the emperor and plotted an usurpation, is not of force.' It is worth while to compare with this the annotation of the patriarch Kyr Philotheus, who wrote as follows to Armenopulus: 'How is it that thou didst not add to what thou hast written, that on account of the golden and holy laws of that great light of the Church, St. John Chrysostom, forbidding to anathematise any Christians so long as they are orthodox, the tomes anathematising traitors and rebels against the emperor are of no force? For this is said by thy fellow Nomophylax, afterwards patriarch of Antioch, Theodore Balsamon; and of the same thou, I am sure, art not ignorant. Either, then, thou oughtest to have added a note to what thou hast said about those tomes, or not have inserted them at all in thine excellent and valuable work. But I now fill up what is wanting to the work of my friend, and I think not impertinently, but with reason, and for a very plain necessity.' But, O most holy patriarch Philotheus, pardon me, if I ask with due reverence, is it not lawful ever to take up and enforce (ἐπανακαινίζειν) laws which have lain a dead letter? and to give effect to tomes which have not before been acted upon, on the spur of some occasion? I know well thou wilt not deny that this may be done, as thou knowest that the power of making and repealing laws has never died out, but abides for ever in the Church, against which the gates of hell are not to prevail. Therefore it is lawful that laws which have been aforetime a dead letter

should be taken up and enforced. And *this* is what has been done by the four patriarchs *on account of the arrogant Nicon*, who *was lifting up himself so as to overtop the emperor in dignity*, and *making himself everything in all affairs*, and becoming a Proteus,[31] and hereby subverting and throwing into confusion the manners (ἦθη) of the empire, yea and the customs of society. And so of necessity [*i.e.* if Nicon's party had their way] those three imperial tomes must fall too, viz. the first, which was made in the reign of Kyr Constantine Porphyrogenitus; the second, of the time of Kyr Manuel Comnenus; and the third, in the time of Kyr Alexius Palæologus.

But allow me to expound a little in explanation of this word 'anathema.' Paul says anathema to him who should preach anything beyond what he had himself preached (Gal. i.); and in his Epistle to the Romans (ch. ix.), 'I could wish to be myself anathema from Christ for the sake of my brethren,' &c.; and in 1 Cor., 'No man calleth Jesus anathema speaking in the Holy Ghost.' [Then he quotes Ecumenius' commentary on these passages.]... Paul's wish was hypothetical—'if it were possible'—and excessive, like that of Moses. So too Augustine.

But to the last [objection of the objectors], that it appears out of place *that a patriarch should give a promise* [or oath] *and* [plight his] *faith to the emperor*, let me say this much in explanation. A promise is a great thing; and he who disregards his own engagement and faith does the greatest possible harm and damage both to himself and to those under him. In proof of this take a story well known among the Arabs: Melek Tarchar had taken prisoner the son of the governor or prince (ὑπάτου) of Antioch; and the Egyptian caliph, being secretly a Christian, though not known to be one, committed the youth to the then patriarch of Jerusalem to be taught and trained. The father, hearing of his being there, sent many and valuable gifts as a ransom to the prelate who was his keeper; and he, swallowing the bait, sent the boy back to his father, giving out that he had died. But—O the judgments of God!—he was taken prisoner a second time by the same Melek Tarchar, who, after recovering from his first amazement, went straight to Jerusalem and questioned the patriarch, who twice and thrice assured him that the

[31] *i.e.* slipping from a spiritual into a secular, and then back into a spiritual potentate.

youth had died. Whereupon Melek Tarchar asked him whether he would assure him by a strict oath that the youth who had been taken prisoner had really died? The patriarch feared, and, being tempted by what he had [already] on his conscience, consented to give a faithful oath upon the holy gospels. But the other was not content with this, but bade him celebrate, and take the oath in the liturgy itself, and kiss the cross of the Lord; 'and then,' said he, 'I shall be well assured: but if you refuse, you shall be punished as a traitor.' The patriarch was compelled, in order to escape falling into the hand of man, to comply: so the poor wretch cast himself headlong into perjury; and before communicating in the mysteries he swore over them and kissed the cross, and then communicated in the precious body and blood unworthily. Of all this Melek Tarchar was a witness. And when he saw the falsehood of the bishop, he immediately ordered the youth to be produced before all. And all being now speechless and without excuse, Melek Tarchar, for his rage and indignation, became such an enemy of the Christians [as he is known to have been]. And he laid waste christian towns and villages, and destroyed monasteries, hospitals, and hermitages to their foundations, for the perjury of the patriarch of Jerusalem. Go to now, thou, whoever thou art, and say, if thou darest, that a man may dissolve the bond of his pledge made and promise given, and break his treaty. But I will not think it too much to add another story of perjury, which is this: Amurath, sultan of the Turks, had made a truce with the Hungarians, being compelled to it by the valour and success of Janka [John Corvinus Huniades] voivode of Transylvania, son of a Wallachian by a Greek mother, who had defeated the Turks twenty times, and was only once routed himself, at Varna. For there came the cardinal Julian Cesarini, legate of Pope Eugenius IV., to persuade Vladislas king of Hungary to make war on Amurath. And so, with the blessing of the cardinal, he collected a large force, crossed the frontier, and marched to Varna; which when Amurath heard, he came across as speedily as possible from Asia (the Venetians and the Genoese betraying the passage, and accepting one gold piece for every Turk that crossed). The Hagarenes in all were 100,000. But when the christian soldiers of Vladislas saw such a host, they were greatly afraid. However, they could not choose but fight, and the battle was desperate and dreadful. Amurath, it is said,

was panic-struck, and thought all lost, and was preparing to go off secretly and escape, after seeing his bodyguard of janizaries put to flight; but looking towards the standard of the king, which had upon it the representation of Christ crucified, he cried out with a loud and bitter cry, 'O Thou, the Crucified, behold the faithlessness of thy worshippers, who basely violate their oaths pledged to me!' And now the Hagarenes, making a stand, and fighting more valiantly than before, gained a great victory [at Varna, Nov. 10, A.D. 1444], which is celebrated to this day. Vladislas, being badly wounded, fell from his horse, and was slain, and buried under a heap of other dead, 30,000 Turks being slain, and 40,000 Christians [the legate also was slain]. Whence we collect that men should not break their faith and the pact of their engagement, even though it have been plighted to infidels. And we see what is the sense of those words in the prayer for such as have bound themselves by an oath: 'Do thou, O Lord, grant to N. thy mercy, breaking the bond of his sins that is upon him; for thou art he who hast mercy on them that are bound, and settest up them that are cast down.' To explain I will take an instance which Gregory relates: 'The emperor Michael confessed to the patriarch Joseph. Wherefore also when [the patriarch] had finished the liturgy with the other bishops, he came and fell down prostrate before the entrance to the βῆμα, openly accusing himself of his sins, and particularly of that of perjury, and of having blinded the late emperor's sons: and thereupon he asked for absolution. The patriarch then first, standing over him as he lay prostrate, read a certain written form; and after him each of the bishops in turn read the same. And so the emperor departed rejoicing with such an absolution, thinking that now he had God reconciled and propitious to him.' But of these things enough.

Chap. XVIII. *How Kyr Joasaph, the new Patriarch, was ordained.*

It was now the Friday in the week called κρεωφάγος,[32] and all flocked together to see the [ordination of] the new patriarch. . . . He came, and took their blessing from the two most blessed patriarchs; and, having saluted the brethren, sat down on a low seat (or bench, σκίμποδος), with a cushion on it, and a carpet

[32] Because they eat meat *every day* in that week before leaving it off.

underneath spread on the floor. He went out with a bodyguard of twelve soldiers after the ceremony, and returned again on the Sabbath afternoon. And Kyr Paisius having said the εὐλογητὸς κ.τ.λ., and Kyr Macarius having incensed after the ἀπόλυσις, there were offered the usual sweets and confectionaries, made of sugar and divers other good things, and with them one silver cup full of Celtic [French, or Cretan?] wine was distributed to each bishop for the fatigue of his attendance and for joy of the announcement; as the Bulgarians used to drink their full cup still called γιμάτο (*i.e.* bumper) when their prince (χρούμου) had conquered Nicephorus[33] surnamed Apogenicus, whose scull was made into a cup.

On the morning of the Sunday of the Carnival, Feb. 10, there was performed in the usual place of the imperial vestibule (προαύλιον) the awful commoration of the second advent, at which were present the emperor, wearing his gold diadem, the patriarch Macarius vested in his patriarchal robes, and around the chiefs of the boyars and of the senate. This custom I suppose to be derived from the time when Bogoris despot of the Bulgarians was converted to Christianity (in the time of Michael son of Theophilus and his mother Theodora), and named Michael after the emperor: for he, having beheld the second advent painted by the monk Methodius, was much touched by it in his heart.

This ceremony finished, we all entered into the great church, and rested within the bema till Kyr Paisius was robed (he wore over his sakkos his double epitrachelion); and the two patriarchal deacons, Anastasius of Alexandria and Paul[34] of Antioch, came to us, calling the bishops two and two, who, making the usual obeisance to the emperor and to the two patriarchs, went up to the high platform, which was all splendidly adorned, surrounded with gold brocades and Syrian damask trimmings, and sat there a short space, till there came also Kyr Joasaph who was to be ordained, slightly supported by the protopresbyter Michael and the protodeacon, also named Michael. He made his profession of faith as usual, &c. Farther, he promised that he would never give any license for intermarrying with the Armenians, Calvinists, and Lutherans, who are out of the Church;

[33] Nicephorus, logothete of Seleucia, was slain by the Bulgarians in A.D. 811.

[34] Who wrote, in Arabic, the travels of his father the patriarch Macarius when he came with him before to Moscow, in A.D. 1654.

and [that he would conform to] some other regulations similar and of like spirit to these; and especially to preserve unimpaired the traditionary customs of the *Eastern* Church; and he distinctly pledged himself to communicate in all things with the four œcumenical patriarchs. And when the time for the *trisagion* was come, lighted candles were given to those within the bema by the two patriarchs, and Kyr Joasaph was brought by two metropolitans, Pitirim of Novgorod and Laurentius of Kazan; and having thrice circled the holy altar (*τῆς ϑείας ᾠδῆ χορείας συνισταμένης, καὶ τοῦ Ἅγιος ψαλλομένου*), he knelt on both knees, and set his forehead against the holy table, and received the divine seal, while all *we* bishops stood round him, and took part in the solemn act of imposition of hands, and ordained him together with the two patriarchs. And the paper was spread out, I mean the *πτερύγιον*, so called because marked with the form of a wing: . . . the gospel was opened and placed [with the writing downwards] upon his head; and the usual words giving the divine grace were pronounced. And after the second and third seal, on his rising from the corner of the holy table, there was given out the Ἄξιος ('He is worthy!'). Then he was robed in all the robes of his dignity, the omophorion, &c.; and, having blessed the emperor and all the people, he sat down on the holy synthronus; and having given the 'Peace be with thee' to the reader; and at the time of the Communion having distributed to the bishops, to each of them in his due order, his particle of the holy things, and afterwards also to the emperor and to the boyars, in their due order, the antidoron and the *sanctification* [*ἁγίασμα, i.e.* the wine and water accompanying the *ἀντίδωρον*] as being himself *sanctified* (*ἡγιασμένος*), he made the dismissal. But after the end of the liturgy we went up again in our mandyas to the raised platform [towards the west end of the church], and Kyr Joasaph began to make a speech of thanks to the monarch Kyr Kyr Alexis Michaelovich, and also to the two patriarchs, thanking them for all their labours and hardships of their long travels undertaken *solely for the well-being and right pilotage of the Church of Christ.* To this, when he had ended, the patriarchs made him a suitable acknowledgment and reply, with the utmost good-will *and most rhetorically.* They added at the same time, very considerately and suitably, certain fraternal exhortations respecting the commission of the

flock to him. . . . And then, taking the splendid mandya with its stripes or rivers (ποταμοὶ), they vested the new patriarch with it (it was studded and embroidered with pearls and jewels): and then they put on him a very precious pectoral, and the white kamilauchion with gold-set seraphim, which the emperor brought and handed to the patriarchs. *Only the pastoral staff, as emblematic of power, he* [*the emperor*], *with the consent of the patriarchs* (μετὰ τῆς πατριαρχικῆς συναινέσεως), *delivered to him with his own hands, having first kissed the right hand* [of the new patriarch]. And this he did *according to the ancient and original tradition.* For Simeon of Thessalonica, in speaking of the ordination of a patriarch, remarks this very same thing, and writes that 'the emperor himself alone *gives the pastoral staff to the patriarch;* because he wishes to honour the Church, implying also at the same time that he personally accepts affectionately this individual now consecrated as his own pastor whom God has chosen for him.'

Having then been thus adorned, Kyr Joasaph blessed the emperor and his Augusta the lady empress, and their imperial sons, and all the imperial princesses by name. And the first of the senate, *Nicetas Odoefsky*, in the name of all the boyars began (ὑπηγόρευσε) to wish the usual polychronion for the emperor, and afterwards, after a suitable address, he wished the like to the new patriarch. And so, after the salutation, all of us the bishops departed with singing of hymns, and with lanterns preceding, to the patriarchal palace; and after a short space we all together went up to the palace, and entered into the dwelling itself of the empress. And the most serene empress was seated with her son Kyr Kyr Alexis Alexievich, and around her were the princesses and many other ladies, wives of the boyars, and the maids of honour of the palace. And having said the Ἄξιον κ.τ.λ., and made the dismissal, and having wished glory to the emperor and to his house (τὴν βασιλικὴν φήμην ὑπαγορεύσαντες), we remained a short time there till the new patriarch had finished giving his blessing to the ladies who were standing around. And then we went to the golden-roofed banquet-hall of the palace, where the emperor was present with only a slight [show of refreshments]: and taking the new patriarch by the hand he seated him close to himself, just to taste a morsel and drink a small glass on account of the long procession and circuit he had

now to make to bless the inner city, according to the old custom derived from new Rome to Moscow.

We went out then, and being seated all of us bishops in low carriages [sledges], we followed the patriarch's carriage of state, which was adorned with marks of distinction (*παράσημα*, banners) and attended by clerks in exact order and with the singing of hymns. And after the circuit and blessing of the city, we returned again to the blessing [or banquet] of the emperor; and immediately after us there came the two patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch, each with all his retinue; whom having met and saluted, we came with joy into the imperial banquet-hall, where were set out silver goblets, gilt ewers, very richly ornamented bowls, costly vessels of plate, and gold-inlaid trays, brought not so much for use as for pomp and display. Among this set-out of plate there were very curious timepieces, with inconceivable tricks of ingenious mechanism. I leave to others the task of describing the meats, the pastry, the sweets, the wines, the mutual pledges of healths, the mixed drinks, &c. *I* would mention only the spiritual presents distributed to the three patriarchs. I should be an ungrateful and an unjust writer if I failed to mention these. Three very long tankards made to represent horns (*χειροκρατῆρες εἰκονικοὶ*), admirably worked and adorned, were given to each patriarch; sacred furniture and gold brocade in no small quantities was sent after them, and other gifts for the church. After which, having all made the usual prayers and good wishes, having drank a full cup to the emperor's health, and having swallowed besides three cups to the healths of the three patriarchs, we departed home with lanterns and torches.

But in the morning Kyr Joasaph went again to bless the remaining part of the city, with the usual procession; and after it he invited the patriarchs and all the bishops to a banquet, to which we went accordingly, having been bidden by the senior metropolitan Pitirim. And a little before we sat down, after we had washed our hands, Paisius of Gaza recited in the ears of all the following epigram, as his own present, *ὀλίγοντε φίλοντε* [being four couplets]. . . . The patriarch, after returning appropriate thanks, bade the metropolitan of Gaza take his place according to the order of the bishops who were seated. And, as the banquet went on, and the mutual good-fellowship grew, we Easterns made a singing like that of the sirens; and many

gifts and precious articles, stuffs, and icons, &c., followed us home, which I forbear to enumerate.

Chap. XIX. *Solutions of certain questions proposed to the three Patriarchs.*

On T. the 12th of February the emperor kept the birthday of his son Alexis Alexievich; and after the vigil service and the liturgy, the patriarch entered with the bishops into the apartment of the empress, where was also the young prince Alexis, and all the choir of the princesses: and, after the usual prayer and blessing, all received from the hands of the prince the festival cake (ἄρτον), and then went to the heaven-roofed banquet-hall. And the emperor, of his joy, made birthday presents and no end of καροκεύματα to the three patriarchs.

On the Sunday of the Cheese-week we assembled, according to the custom, at the patriarchate; and having there asked pardon of one another, we went to the emperor, and having done the usual homage, we asked pardon for our faults, and he with much humility asked pardon in like manner of us. . .

And whereas it had been ordered by the two patriarchs that all the bishops should wear black and not white kamilauchia for greater unity, those who had them white prayed not to be deprived of them. And the most serene emperor promised to speak with the patriarchs, that they should not compel them to change. And so, having received the blessing, he went back into the sacred palace.

And towards evening the emperor came to the two patriarchs, to their own lodgings, as if to receive their blessing and to ask their forgiveness. And as an act of friendly condescension he presented to each one of the suite a cupful of the best mixed wine; and lastly he offered the usual good wishes to the patriarchs, that they might have a profitable and edifying commencement of Lent; and so, having been himself blessed, he departed.

The commencement of the fast dawned; and after abstinence from food for three days, the emperor, after the liturgy of the Presanctified (on the Wednesday), sent to the patriarchs and to the other bishops some sweetmeats, as if for the end of the three days' abstinence from food. And again on the Friday, after the liturgy of the Presanctified, all the archimandrites and

hegoumens brought, according to custom, to the patriarchs and to the other bishops huge loaves of a blackish colour with a little beer (ζῆθος), that is barley-wine, and with herbs prepared with salt [salted red cabbage], gifts in truth slight, but suitable for monks and for the fast. In these days the emperor Alexis touches no fish nor caviar, but eats only cabbage and pulse. He eats on other days pulse and dry fruits and vegetables, and drinks water, or beer and hydromel.

But I must not omit mentioning the questions which were raised. The first was this: What is the Invitatory week (προσφωνήσιμος), and what is the Cheese-eating week (ἡ τυροφάγος)? and From whom is the liturgy of the Presanctified? and Why is the holy Bread dipped in [smeared with] the Blood? To which the patriarchs answered thus: 'The Invitatory week invites to the exercises of the fast; or, one may say that it is proclamatory, as Hermes or the heralds proclaimed peace or war; and the Greeks had certain preludes, proœmia, overtures, introductory flourishes, and the like. The first three weeks prefixed to the fast are weeks of preparation. Some say that we allow meat to be eaten every day during the first of these weeks out of opposition to the fast of the Armenians called Artibourion. In the Cheese-week even monks eat cheese, butter, and eggs on the Wednesday and Friday, upsetting the Jacobites and the Tetradites. And formerly, as in the time of the patriarch Nicephorus, the liturgy of the Presanctified was celebrated on the Wednesday and Friday of this week; but now it is not: as neither is it now celebrated on the Great Friday; though in the West they celebrate their liturgy of the Presanctified upon Good Friday, by order, as it is said, of Pope Innocent. [Then follows an account of St. Gregory the Illuminator.] None of his family knew Greek: so he wrote to the emperor Theodosius to get letters made for the Armenians. The emperor sent to them Phœnicius, who made their letters for them, and instructed some of them, who afterwards, coming to Ionia, were apprehended, but subsequently released, when they had vindicated themselves, by order of Theodosius; and having come to C.P. they swore ever to keep the faith, and to receive their ordinations from the five apostolic thrones: and their first nineteen catholicoses did so: and among these there was one most prophetic man named Narses, who sat thirty-four years. After his time they fell away from the five apostolic thrones: and the

schismatical bishops were eleven in number, who broke the commands of St. Gregory, and the traditions ratified by oath and anathema of king Tiridates, bidding them always take their catholicos from the metropolitan of Cesarea for the time being, and preferred to follow Eutyches and Dioscorus and Leuco-Petrus, and take from the emir of Syria their ordinations. They remained orthodox about 348 years or more, till the Third council of Ephesus, &c. [with a long and fabulous account of the fasts of the Armenians, all in reference to the first question, about the week here called Invitatory.]

Now for the week called τυροφάγος, or Cheese-eating: The Jews of Jerusalem, who had assisted Chosroes against the Christians, came out to Heraclius, on his triumphal return after six years, with a petition for immunities, which he unsuspectingly granted. Afterwards the monks got him to punish the Jews, taking on themselves a voluntary penance of abstaining during this week even from cheese and eggs. But after his death they returned to their former custom, and ate them. They say that the observance of this week was instituted by the Nicene fathers, and even that of the Invitatory week also, so that nineteen weeks, ending with the flesh-eating week of Pentecost and All Saints' Sunday, correspond to the nineteen years of their paschal cycle.

To the third question, Whether mention should be made of Pope Gregory Dialogus in the dismissal of the Presanctified? Though Margonius Maximus, bishop of Cythera in Cyprus, has written that this liturgy was instituted by him during the fast for the Easterns, who still use it, this has seemed doubtful to many, because it is not found among the works of St. Gregory, nor was it translated into Greek by his successor the Athenian Pope Zachary. And there were two Gregories called Dialogus. Still, as the Greeks and Arabs, Armenians and *Catholics*, and the bishops of the five lordships (δεσποτειῶν) of Iberia, being sixty and more in number, all think and say so; and all the bishops of the East with one voice and judgment hold that the great Gregory, who in the time of the emperor Maurice was sent by the then Pope to C.P., is the original source of the liturgy of the Presanctified, it is not improbable that he was so. Wherefore Nicetas Pectoratus blames the Latins for saying masses during Lent, contrary to the canons of Laodicea (xlix. and li.) and of the council in Trullo (lii.). It is wrong to ascribe

it to Germanus patriarch of C.P., as it is not said that he *composed*, but only that he *explained* the liturgy. In truth the first composer of a liturgy was *our* hierarch James, and after him Clement of Rome; also Mark the apostle; and afterwards Basil the Great by abbreviating [the prayers of] the liturgy of St. James, as Proclus the disciple of St. John Chrysostom relates (and St. Amphilochius says that Basil wrote what he wrote in ecstasy); and last of all St. John Chrysostom.

To the fourth question, If it is allowable to dip the portion of the consecrated gifts (*ἁγιάσματα*) which is to be reserved in the Blood with the spoon, of which some doubt, saying that where the body is, the two being united, there is also the blood, the patriarchs said that it ought to be so done, according to a most ancient custom of the holy Eastern Church. And Armenopulus relates what Pope Theodore did in the condemnation of Pyrrhus [Theodore being by origin from Jerusalem]. . . . St. Basil is related to have dipped one of the four parts of the Lamb in the Blood, and to have reserved it for his death; a custom still retained in Scio.

Chap. XX. *Of certain other questions moved during the great Lent.*

The Sunday of Orthodoxy [the first Sunday in Lent] was now come. Our two patriarchs remained at home. Kyr Joasaph alone with the local bishops, the emperor, &c., were present. And Michael the protodeacon began to read out the synodicon, and they all responded 'Everlasting memory,' or 'Anathema, anathema, anathema!' And the first question asked was about those who had simply fallen in war, whom Nicephorus Phocas wanted to proclaim martyrs. But Basil even suspends them from the communion. [See Matthew Blastar in note x. on the synod of Gangra, in which anathema was pronounced against those who refuse the fasts of the Church, &c., as the Fourth council anathematised those who have been ordained simoniacally, whereas the synodical tome made in the time of Constantine Porphyrogenitus and the patriarch Alexius anathematises those who rebel against the emperor.] But Basil the Great confesses that the fathers did not reckon the killing of men in the wars as murderers or homicides, exculpating, as it seems to me, those who contend in defence of chastity and

piety; still, he counsels abstinence for three years from communion; though some blame him for this. And though such as fall in war are not to be called martyrs, still to award them everlasting memory (*αἰώνιον μνήμην*) is just and proper.

Then came the festival of Porphyrius bishop of Gaza; and the emperor came to the two patriarchs with the chief boyars and the patriarch of Moscow, and all the choir of the bishops. And our all-wise autocrat proposed certain heads, truly worthy of his most intelligent mind, the most important of which by far was the question *whether the Latins ought to be rebaptised?* For among the other innovations of the Latins, he said, for which they have been rent off (or have rent themselves off, *ἀπερράγησαν*) from the Catholic Church, Simeon of Thessalonica reckons also this, in his treatise On Heresies, saying: 'Moreover they administer baptism not as the Church has received, but after another custom: for they administer it not with three immersions, but with three affusions, and without the *μύρον* [the chrism of confirmation, which all the ancients joined, and which the Easterns still invariably join with baptism]. Wherefore also most of their children [who die young] remain unsealed.

A few days passed, and the questions were resolved very wisely and clearly, and [the answers] were translated into the Slavonic tongue. And so they [the questions probably alone, before the discussion] were read in a synod in the hearing of all, both the bishops and the boyars, on the 10th of March.

Then the emperor, all being seated in order, began to ask 'what opinion had the bishops about the Latins; that is, whether their baptism is canonical [valid]? For the Westerns prefer to baptise by three affusions rather than by three immersions; and some use only *aspersion*, as we have heard, without any necessity. But the Spaniards formerly were used to baptise with only one immersion, to show their horror, as I understand, of Arianism, which had most falsely imagined progressive steps in the Trinity.'

The answers of most of the bishops showed great diversity of opinions. But the metropolitan of Gaza, standing in the midst, answered to the point thus: 'Know, O most serene and divinely-appointed emperor, and let all this synod know, the most excellent answer and doctrine of the eminent Theodoret, which may serve as a Delian oracle for this your present ques-

tion. He says then: "As many as use in a sound sense the invocation of the holy Trinity, neither adding anything nor taking anything away, baptise canonically [*i. e.* validly], and such as are baptised by them are perfectly baptised" (*ἄμεμπτοι*). Hence the canon of the Second council (of C.P.) determines that the Arians are not to be rebaptised. If, then, the form of the invocation be unchanged, the matter of water unsophisticated (*ἀμεταποίητον*), *and the priest canonically ordained*, that baptism is to be considered sound and blameless. But the baptism of the Latins halts neither in the matter nor in the form; and farther, the priest (who ordinarily baptises) baptises with the right intention, according to the custom of the apostolic Church. Consequently the baptism of the Latins is good. It would have been doubtful if they baptised with an addition to the words, "in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost," thus, "who proceeds from the Father and the Son:" but they do not this, nor are reported by any to do it.'

After *long* and *most sharp contention*, the words of St. Cyprian were brought up again, who says that *all heretics and schismatics are to be rebaptised;* &c. Yet this same Cyprian says: 'Nevertheless, since it has seemed good to some in Asia, out of economy, to receive the baptism of the Cathari (or Novatian schismatics), let the baptism of these also be received.' But the synod said that the question must be examined farther. So the metropolitan of Gaza said again thus: 'That *we* Easterns think the *Latins* to be *schismatics*, and they reciprocally call *us Romans* schismatics, is notorious to all. But the question to be considered is this: How did the divine fathers receive *schismatics* who were *not aliens from the faith*, but differed only about certain ecclesiastical questions? Now it was the common rule that the baptism of schismatics was not to be disallowed. For the fathers of the Second council made of them all two divisions, one of those who were not to be baptised, the other of those who were to be rebaptised. . . . So the Encratitæ, who abhorred marriage, are anointed with the holy myron, but not rebaptised, and the Aquarii, and the Novatians. But they who made confusion in the Trinity, baptising into a joint Son and Father, as the Sabellians, and the Arians,[31] and the Macedonians, who called the

[31] That is, as he had explained above, the *later Arians*, who baptised into 'the name of the Father greater, the Son less, and the Holy Ghost less still.'

Spirit a creature, are rebaptised. Therefore they who do not confound the Trinity are not to be rebaptised, but only anointed with the chrism. Nor let any one object their affusions instead of immersions. For Eusebius thought it right to plunge head downwards with one immersion only. And Gregory the Divine (in his sermon xliv., Of Lent) writes: "I understand [of baptism] the three breathings of Elias on the widow's son, and the pourings of water on the wood on Carmel;" and again in sermon xl. But this I say not that I think that we ought not to make the three immersions, which are celebrated by the holy apostles and by Dionysius the Areopagite, and are excellently explained by the patriarch Xiphylinus. . . . But that I may not raise ten thousand scandals and civil feuds against the two Churches; for I fear the woe pronounced against him by whom scandal cometh, [I will say no more].'

Then was brought in and read what was written by Sylvester Syropulus in his History of the Council of Florence. And before that Gregory the protosyncellus, having a long discussion with Peter of Calabria about baptism, attempted to prove that the Latins are unbaptised, first, from the positive rule of the fathers how baptism is to be administered, and their explanation of the significance of each part of the act; and secondly, from the sense of the word *baptism* (*βαπτισμός*).

But the bishops of *White Russia* [where they were mixed with the Uniats] said: 'These arguments, which are here written, are politic refinements (*κομψεύματα*). For there are times when we affuse immersing, and there are times when we immerse affusing, as daily experience shows, confirming the common custom, which, without fixed limit and indifferently, does this both by affusion and by immersion, according to the local custom established among us, when the spiritual matrix, the font, is too small to receive the whole child for complete immersion. But these by the outside philosophers are said to be circumstantial accidents, and nothing essential to the completeness of the sacrament. Only the *form* is essential. For Xiphylinus says: "For such as, &c. [as above] are baptised." Let the opponents then take heed lest they fall into the pit of the Anabaptists: for we ought to receive "*one* baptism" of the Lord, as we have been taught by the creed,' &c. &c.

But the Russian bishops objected the forms, 'Ego baptizo,'

'Ego absolvo,' and the like; whereas *we* recognise the priest only as a living instrument of the Holy Ghost, &c. Whence also we use the form 'The divine grace,' &c. and not 'I ordain thee,' &c. However, in the gospel we have both 'He who *is baptised*,' passive, and 'Go *ye*' and '*baptise ye*,' active. And Paul says, 'I baptised none of you,' &c. . . . Hence it is also concluded that it is not right to rebaptise either the Armenians, or the Jacobites, or the Nestorians, according to the custom [now] prevalent in the Eastern Church. For they do not now hold to the foul doctrines of their first founders. For in the time of Theophanes of blessed memory, patriarch of Jerusalem, there was sent one, the metropolitan of Berrhœa, to inquire in a friendly way about the questions of faith to the Nestorians who had come from Babylon to Jerusalem as pilgrims: and that eminent bishop, after close questioning, found that they confessed the Panagia (the all-holy Virgin) to be Mother of God, and God the Word to have been truly incarnate, and the economy not to have been only fantastic. And the Armenians of this present time confess that *we Romans* are their fathers; for the grace, that is, of ordination, which they received from the metropolitan of Cesarea; and also on account of St. John Chrysostom, who in the time of his exile taught many Armenians in Cucusus. Since, then, they do not err in the *form* of baptism, &c. . . . on this account they are neither rebaptised nor reordained.

The hieromonach Methodius once asked Theodorus the Studite whether a priest ordained by an heretical or a deposed bishop could perform sacerdotal functions? and Theodorus answered, 'As a corrupt tree cannot bring forth good fruit, so neither,' &c. And this agrees with what St. Basil writes to the Nicopolitans: 'I know not as a bishop, nor would I reckon among the priests of Christ, the man who has been promoted by impure hands for the destruction of the faith, &c. This is my judgment.' See, this father rejects the ordination of heretics. And Tarasius patriarch of C.P. says: 'And I also reject them, &c.; especially if there were orthodox bishops by whom they might have been ordained.' So, then, the divine fathers rejected such ordinations on the ground that *there was no excuse*. *Whence* (that is, on the ground that in other cases there *was some excuse*) those who lived later, without being ignorant of St. Basil's opinion, have condescendingly received those who had been ordained

by heretics, &c. When Paul of Samosata was deposed as a heretic, those ordained by him, though his aiders and abettors, were tolerated as bishops by the synod of Antioch; of whom one was Kyr Hymenæus of Jerusalem, and another Gregory Thaumaturgus of Neo-Cesarea. At Nice there were many Arians, who all, on subscribing, were received as bishops. St. Meletius was ordained by the Arians to Sebaste, and thence translated by the same party to Berrhœa, and again to Antioch: yet, when he aided orthodoxy, it was not imputed to him; and he ordained St. John Chrysostom hierodiacon, and also St. Basil, as Socrates and Amphilochius attest, and restored Gregory the Divine to C.P.: and Gregory of Nyssa calls him a saint, and a new apostle. And St. Basil received as a bishop Eustathius of Sebaste, who had been a Macedonian. Between the First and the Second councils there were above forty years; and many had been ordained by Macedonius, Eusebius, Eudoxus, and others; yet they all were received in the Second council. The Arian Cyril, intruded into the place of St. Maximus of Jerusalem, is reckoned a saint by those ordained by him, and is celebrated as an Olympic *Nicon* [*i.e.* conqueror] by St. Gregory of Nyssa; and he is found in the Second council as a prominent personage (*προιστὼς*), though Maximus was still living, without being accused for his intrusion. And at Rome Novatus had many followers, &c. &c. [at great length].

'We are satisfied about this. Enough!' the synod said. 'But there remains a doubt about baptism, which is the foundation of all. But when there is a doubt, St. Cyril of Alexandria says, we ought to rebaptise for security. A woman bare twins, and on the tenth day tumours came out. The mother, seeing one of the children in danger, took it to the church and had it baptised: and after two years, when the children were grown, she wished to have the unbaptised one baptised, but could not tell which it was. The priest referred to St. Cyril, who bade him baptise both, with the addition of the words: "The unbaptised N. is baptised," &c. In like manner did Kyr Macarius patriarch of Antioch, who recently went *αὐτομολήσας* (*i.e.* without the permission of the Turks) to the five principalities of Iberia, and there having found many of the people, small and great, quite ignorant whether they had been baptised or no, bade that they should all be baptised hypothetically by the form, "The unbaptised N. is baptised," &c.'

The question was once raised by the bishop of Heraclea Manuel, whether one baptised by a lay person was to be received as a believer, this having occurred in his diocese, and the local synod having decided that such should be rebaptised according to canons xlvi. and xlvii. of the Apostles (see too xxvi. and xlvi. of Laodicea and Carthage). So they should be rebaptised conditionally. But if any one object what is related of St. Athanasius, let him remember the civil law which decrees that what is contrary to the canons is not to be made into a precedent, and that an exceptional case is no law of the Church. But here I should insert what occurred in the time of Hippolytus Calaron of blessed memory, my maternal uncle, metropolitan of Rieta (ὁ Ῥιέτης), and the wonder of Chios. At the time of the reduction of Cyprus, after the lamentable desolation of that illustrious island, a lady of Cyprus who had been made captive was taken to the harem of the pasha, and bore a son. The pasha, seeing her weeping over her child, took it and baptised it forthwith himself, using the right words. She thanked him. It chanced that the capitan pasha went off with the fleet for C.P., and on the way put into harbour at Chios. The mother, who was watching for a favourable opportunity, sent the child to be baptised. It was taken to the priest (*καμπάναν*) of the church of the Archangels. All the exorcisms &c. were read, and the preparatory prayers; the moment for baptising was come; and the priest having said 'The servant of God N. is baptised'—O the miracle!—all the water in the font dried up as if turned to ice. The priest, trembling, went off to tell the metropolitan; and he, being equally astounded, bade him inquire whether the child had not been already baptised? The woman-servant who brought the child answered, 'If a Hagarene can baptise, it has.' This story is found at length in the codex of the metropolitan see at Chios: and the most respectable clerk John Triacontaphyllus, who is still living, relates and attests the miracle. Hence it is collected that a layman also in case of need can baptise; with which Gabriel of Philadelphia agrees. Nevertheless, it is not well concluded hence that the baptism of the Calvinists and Lutherans (Calvino-Lutherans) is to be allowed, since they make a constant practice of that which is tolerable only in cases of necessity, and have attempted to destroy utterly the priesthood of the Church, absurdly trying to prove that priesthood is not a necessary sacrament, nor by any

means most useful in Christ's Church. But one swallow [as the case of St. Athanasius] does not make a spring.

To this the most holy patriarchs said: 'The present question is not about the Luthero-Calvinists, who are altogether without priests, and are savagely hostile to the episcopate, but about the baptism of the Latins (for to limit to the Orientals the validity of baptism, and to exclude all the rest from Christianity, *I should call* too narrow, not to say cruel). Is there any ancient decision about this? or is there not? He who knows, by all means let him speak, that he may not fall into condemnation, and suffer the punishment of that bad and slothful servant who hid his lord's talent in the earth.'

The metropolitan of Gaza rose up and said: 'What I shall say I shall say not from myself (as the Saviour said), but what I have heard from my father in the law that will I speak; for to speak anything of oneself is to speak outside of the Scriptures, which is the characteristic of false prophets. But hear the Lord saying through Ezechiel: "I have not sent them: they have spoken of themselves; and they speak out of their own belly." Therefore listen, O divine and holy synod, to what has been pronounced by the holy and great synod held in the year 6992 [that is, in A.D. 1484] in the church of Παμμακαριστὴ at C.P. under the presidency of the most holy patriarch Kyr Simeon of C.P. and Gregory pope of Alexandria, Dorotheus of Antioch, and Joachim of Jerusalem. Let there be brought in for proof of what shall be said the most ancient book[32] of the Holy Mountain of the imperial monastery of the Iberians.'

So it was brought in, and was read distinctly with a loud voice by the metropolitan of Gaza, containing the following: 'Form and order fixed by the holy and great synod itself for those who turn from the Latin doctrines to the orthodox and catholic Church of C.P. and to the three most holy patriarchs of the East, that is, of Alexandria and Antioch and Jerusalem, appointed in the year 6992 (A.D. 1484) in C.P. in the patriarchate of the most holy patriarch Kyr Simeon.' And it runs as follows: 'The priest, having put on his epitrachelion, says the Εὐλογητὸς, κ.τ.λ. And after having said the Βασιλεῦ οὐράνε, κ.τ.λ. and what follows, he places him who is converted from the Latins to the orthodox

[32] See above, p. 265; and *Travels of Macarius*, p. 174, 321. Also see '*Dissertations on the Orthodox Communion*,' p. 188-197.

faith in front of the holy doors of the bema or sanctuary, and asks him [divers questions]; and after he has recited correctly all the creed, such an one is *anointed* by the priest with the holy and great myron of the Church, and the priest exclaims in anointing each sense, "*The seal* of the gift of the Holy Ghost, Amen."'

'It is ended, and completely ended,' exclaimed the two œcumenical patriarchs. 'This is the faith of the orthodox. All that the patriarchs before us have defined we also without change define, diminishing nothing nor adding anything in any way beyond the landmarks laid down by the inspired and god-fearing fathers.' And so the synod that had been convoked ended, and there was a final decision made on this subject, yea, and a constitution,[33] that no one should any more contend about this question, as having been already synodically determined and settled from of old by the four œcumenical patriarchs. These things having been thus capitulated and synodically determined, and entered in the patriarchal registers for perpetual memory, all, after prayer and blessing, departed home. [This was on the 15th March 1667.]

Chap. XXI. *Of other occurrences during the great fast.*

There is a canon of the First council of Nice (canon vi.): 'Let the ancient customs prevail,' &c. Now a custom has grown in some parts of the East, a custom which especially flourishes in Scio, of reading every Friday during Lent, except in the first and sixth weeks, in the vespers the six οἶκοι of the Akathist hymn. This custom the patriarchs approved, and desired that it should on no account be laid aside, but rather be confirmed and extended. And *the distinguished preacher and coryphæus of divine rhetoricians* the metropolitan of Gaza Paisius was appointed to take for his text any passage he pleased in these six οἶκοι. So all flocked together to hear his mellifluous doctrines [uttered in Greek] and lofty conceits. And he showed from Acacius of St. Sabba that these alphabetical οἶκοι were by no means composed (as the vulgar story is) by the Monothelite patriarch of C.P. Sergius, but rather by St. Andrew of Jerusalem, sometime metropolitan of Crete, who brought as a gift to Sergius the great

[33] Confirming those of Nicon, made in 1655 and 1656. Nevertheless the very same custom of rebaptising the Latins, thus corrected by the Eastern patriarchs in Russia, was introduced among themselves before another century had passed, without any synod, merely by a patriarchal constitution.

kanon, the Life of St. Mary of Egypt, and these oikoi of the Akathist. In the time of Heraclius Andrew was chartophylax of the great church, &c. &c.

Then dawned the festival of the most patient and new Job, Alexius the man of God; and all Moscow, rejoicing at the names-day (γενέθλια) of our emperor, the desire of the world, flocked together to his church of the same name. And the three patriarchs together, in three most splendid carriages (sledges), came to celebrate the liturgy. And the emperor came, and all the synclete with him. On this day *the archbishop of Astrachan Kyr Joseph* was honoured by the three patriarchs with the episcopal sakkos for good reasons, as his chrysobulla sets forth, and was raised to the rank of metropolitan, to rank after the metropolitan of Kazan, for Astrachan also was a capital. The metropolitan of Kostoff objected, but he was not listened to. For the emperor is styled Emperor (βασιλεὺς) of Novgorod, Kazan, and Astrachan, but only Great Hossoudar (Μέγας Αὐθέντης) of Rostoff and of Yaroslaff. After all we were invited to a most splendid banquet; and gifts were given to the three patriarchs of gilt cups, rich stuffs, choice Siberian furs, &c. &c.

It was considered however circumstantially, and not of superfluous curiosity, but seriously, *whether it was a canonical and unexceptionable proceeding for the divinely-guarded and holy emperor by his own direct act to exalt or degrade the ecclesiastical chairs?* For this seems very difficult to make out (δυσδιεξήγητον λίαν), because it seems to belong (συντείνειν) to the patriarchs for the time being, who are the proper superintendents and managers over the ecclesiastical affairs.

After great and compendious diligence and particular inquiry, there was found in book ii. of the Πρόχειρον τῶν βασιλικῶν νομίμων (*i.e.* Manual of the Imperial Laws), in which are also the Imperial Constitutions (βασιλικαὶ διατάξεις), c. iv., the following insertion of Balsamon: 'Of its being permitted to the emperor to raise bishopries to the rank of metropolitan sees.' 'You should know,' he says, 'that in May of the 10th Indiction (ἐπινέμησις), in A.M. 6595 [A.D. 1087], there was a note from our emperor Alexius Comnenus to the effect that the metropolitan see of Basileon and that of Madytæ being about to be voted empty, the metropolitans of Heraclea and Ancyra rose up and objected that such churches, though they had been honoured

with the title of metropolitan sees, ought not to be reckoned by the great church [among its dependencies], but by themselves, because the church of Madytæ belonged to Heraclea, and that of Basileon to Ancyra, quoting canon xii. of Chalcedon. There was an imperial judgment made, in the presence of the emperor and the synod, which then judged concurrently with him, that it was permitted to the emperor to give a rank of precedence to the churches, and to raise the bishopries or archbishopries to be metropolitan sees, and to fix what related to their votes and the rest of their ordering (διευθετήσεως) according to his own will, without hindrance from the canon ordering that there shall be preserved to the metropolis the rights belonging to it previously with respect to the see now honoured. And this note was read, explaining how his preservation of the rights previously existing is to be understood. For we, owing to its length, have not inserted it here entire. But I remark from the same, after the narrative containing this, that the churches thus honoured by imperial command are reckoned to depend on the see of C.P., and their former metropolitans are to have no power over them. It contains word for word as follows: 'But since the bishops again adduced the canon of Chalcedon, and said that those who by imperial command were honoured with a higher rank were so honoured uncanonically, and wished some check to be put to unreasonable appetites, my empire also, not wishing this privilege given by the divine canons to be neglected, &c., declares illegal all such promotion if obtained by application, and not *ex mero motu* of the emperor.' But that the emperor really has this privilege may be plainly seen from the ordinance (διατύπωσις) made in the time of Leo Sapiens and of Andronicus son of Michael Palæologus, as is found in the Νέα Σύνοψις τῶν διαφορῶν ἱστοριῶν. This emperor honoured many metropolitans, raising them from small thrones to great. For instance, Monembasia, which was aforetime an episcopal see under Corinth, he raised by a chrysobulla, and gave it the privilege of representing the chair of Jerusalem in synods. So the bishop of Mileni (ὁ Μιλενικὸς) was under Serræ; and Siberia was a parish in Great Russia (ἐνορία). And John Cantacuzene gave the title of παναγιώτατος (supremely all-holy) to the metropolitan of Thessalonica, and the same to Monembasia, with the title of exarch of all the Peloponnese. And Demetrius Chomatenus, writing to Constantine Ca-

basilas, in the second of his questions, 'Whether a bishop who has accepted can be translated,' cites an order of the emperor Manuel Comneni Porphyrogenitus to the synod, ordering it to raise Florus the deacon, who had been elected to the church of Myra in Lycia, to the renowned metropolitan see of Thessalonica, then vacant. 'For the emperor,' he says, 'as being, and being called, the common master of science (ἐπιστημονάρχης) for the churches, is *director even over the synodical* judgments (ἐπιστατεῖ), and giving them their force regulates the ecclesiastical ranks, and *legislates for the life and polity of the clergy* (βίῳ καὶ πολιτείᾳ τῶν τοῦ βήματος); *yea, and for the causes* (δίκαις) *of bishops and clerks*, and *also for the votes* [elections] *of vacant churches;* and he advances from a less honour to a greater, *e.g.* from being a bishopric to being a metropolitan see, &c., out of respect either to the merit of the individual, or to honour the city. *All this* may be more easily learned by him who wishes it *from the contents of the sacred canons* and the new legislation of the Novells of Justinian, to be found in all the third book of the Basilica, which treats at length of their privileges and state of life, and criminal and civil suits. And, to speak briefly, *with the single exception of officiating in sacred things, all the other episcopal privileges are clearly represented by the emperor;* and *in respect of them he acts lawfully* and *canonically.*' There is found also in lib. xix. of the Jewish Antiquities of Flavius Josephus an imperial subscription running thus: 'Tiberius Claudius Cæsar Augustus Germanicus *Pontifex Maximus*, Trib. Pot. Consul XI.' And seeing that the emperor for the time being is also the Lord's anointed, on account of the chrism of the empire, and that Christ our God, besides other titles, both is and is entitled our high-priest or bishop, *the emperor also is reasonably adorned with episcopal graces.*

It was in *imitation*, then, and *emulation* of *these precedents* that our glorious and christian emperor Kyr Kyr Alexis Michaelovich (may the Lord multiply his years!) acted when, considering the orthodox faith shooting up like a vine, and increasing like young olives around the table of its churches, he corrected as an instructor (ἐπιστημονάρχης, a master of sciences) the oversights of the Russian Church, and gave orders to found new bishopries for the government and correction of the faithful. For seeing that the harvest was great, and had increased an hundredfold, he

chose out and appointed over it many husbandmen to reap the rich ears of the vast field of the Church, as may be learned better from *the contents of his chrysobulla*, and from the *constitution* for the *ordering of the episcopal thrones*, which shall be appended below ἐν τῷ συνοδικῷ κανονίῳ, ἐν τῷ δελταρίῳ.

The feast of the Annunciation, the natale mundi, was now come, and brought with it gold-covered gospels to the metropolitans *Jonah of Rostoff* and *Paul of Kroutitz*, and new sakkoses of gold brocade, as presents from the emperor, in which they celebrated the liturgy, together with the three patriarchs, in the imperial convent of the Annunciation. The first[34] Russian bishop who ever wore a sakkos in Moscow was the senior metropolitan of Novgorod. But whence he got this privilege they are not all agreed . . . After a time it became a matter of emulation, and the metropolitan of Kazan obtained it; and now in our time four others are adorned with it, viz. Joseph of Astrachan, Jonah of Rostoff, Paul of Kroutitz, and Theodosius of Archangel, wearing not only the image of the six-winged seraphim, &c. &c. Here let me stop to explain how the sakkos, a type of grief and extreme tribulation, is taken at the same time as a symbol of joy and majesty. Besides the sakkos (sackcloth) of fasting, the emperors wore it at their coronation, and on festivals: and Theodosius the younger gave to St. John Chrysostom, on the Epiphany, his own sakkos; whence the other patriarchs wished to have it too. It was also given, as time went on, to the chief metropolitans, to signify Christ's passion.

The fast of Lent was ended; and according to old custom the doors of all the secular tribunals were closed. But the doors of repentance were opened wide, and all were invited. Noah was well called Deucalion, as Δεῦτε καλέων (Hither *call*ing) to repentance. Constantine the Great used to say that if any of the clergy misconducted themselves, he would wish to hide them under his own purple, that the royal priesthood might not be disgraced. [Then he tells a story of Constantine's turning the tables upon some informers against a clerk, making them first watch the clerk, then hastening before them to the house, putting the clerk into a jar, and sitting on him, and bidding the informers, who followed, to find him if they could, or be punished as slanderers.] But why speak of Constantine? What multi-

[34] Now there is no bishop in Russia who does not wear the sakkos.

tudes of scandals hast not thou, O emperor, known and dissembled? I will speak only of thy goodness to myself, immortal benefits, which no time can efface, as already set and graven in adamant. For what intemperance and turpitude[35] did Nicon leave unnamed, the accusation of which he did not belch out against me, the stranger bishop? What act or thought of mind did he not at the same time pillory? Or what word of mine, or habit, or turn, did he leave unwounded, unthrust at? None, in truth; none whatever. And yet my long-living and most intelligent emperor regarded all these imputations against me as empty and vain, and set them aside as if they were nothing: and tearing them away and breaking through them as if they were cobwebs, *as indeed they were*, he flung them aside, giving them not a thought. But enough. There is no need of many words when deeds sound like Dodonæan brass, and when, if we were silent, the very stones would cry out, &c. &c.

Chap. XXII. *Of the Procession on Palm-Sunday, and the Patriarch's riding.*

This day was observed with great pomp. The patriarch rode on a white horse, led about by *his eldest son* our most potent emperor, who held the rein, robed in his imperial robes. Constantine thus held the rein of Silvester when he departed from old Rome, giving him the Lateran palace. And Justinian did the like for Agatho [Agapetus, in A.D. 536] when that pope had come to new Rome and deposed Anthimus and ordained Mennas in his place. . . Hephæstion in old time was scandalised at seeing Alexander do this to Jaddua: but Alexander answered well. And now our emperor led by the rein [playing on the word, as if it might mean also reined, bridled, silenced, ἐχαλινογώσησε] not so much that horse on which Kyr Joasaph rode as the Luthero-Calvinists, who set at naught the priesthood.

All of us bishops put on within the bema each his own robes; and the beginning of the usual παράκλησις having been made, and we having made, two and two, the usual low reverences (στρώτας μετανοίας) to the emperor, we went out in order from the great door of the great church, saying the λιτεία; and, having blessed the palace, we went with our pastoral staffs, stepping

[35] But see the letter of Dositheus patriarch of Jerusalem, written to the tsar in November 1670, given below among the Appendices.

slowly, preceded by the cross, with lanterns and torches about it, and after it by the imperial standard of the double-headed eagle, the singers singing sweetly the troparion composed by the emperor Theophilus, according to Cedrenus, 'Go forth, ye Gentiles, go forth also, ye people! behold the king of heaven,' &c. till we came to the handsome convent of the Trinity, where the palm-bearing festival is usually celebrated (it is surrounded by red palisades). And there the patriarch Kyr Joasaph (the other two being very weak after the frequent and long services of the Lent fast) changed his patriarchal attire for other more festal robes, as did likewise our emperor, putting on all his imperial robes (a diadem with pearls as big as small nuts, a most rich crown, pectorals with huge emeralds worth thousands of gold pieces, wood of the true cross on his breast: it was indeed a sight to astonish the whole city): and so we came, saying the liteia, to a circular space girt with a stone parapet, like an old amphitheatre, where, after the antiphonal singing of psalms and hymns, the gospel was read. But when they were almost come to that place in it where it is written (Matt. xx.), 'Then Jesus sent two of his disciples, saying to them, Go to the village,' &c. there appeared two priests, the proto-presbyter and the sceuophylax (sacristan), who, taking permission by a reverence, went to bring the colt. And, standing at some distance from the circular space above mentioned, they led thence a horse covered over with white cloth housings; and the patriarch mounted, bearing in his right hand the cross, and having the gospel resting on his breast, and so he went, blessing the people: and we slowly followed behind, the singing-boys already singing around a certain tree adorned with divers fruits, apples filled with all manner of sweets, &c. On the ground were strewn small bits of cloth of many colours; and along all the middle of the way were laid down choice carpets (ἔππλα), on which the horse, arching his neck, went pompously, as if conscious of his precious burden, &c.

After this spiritual ride and public procession we entered into the church to celebrate the liturgy, and the other two patriarchs also came, having been invited previously. And the first of the concelebrating archimandrites gave out in the bema the benediction Εὐλογημένη κ.τ.λ. [with which the liturgy begins]; and he and other priests said the three secret prayers representing the angels; and the singers sang the [corresponding] antiphones

outside, representing the prophets. Here I will explain the origin of this excellent idea. Some of the Jewish children cried 'Hosanna to the Son of David!' others responded, 'Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord!' the first being the prophets who went before, the second the martyrs and doctors, according to Theophylact and Epiphanius; and the crowd and the fathers of the children reëchoed, 'Hosanna in the highest! God is the Lord, and he has appeared to us!' Hence the like is sung now on Palm-Sunday antiphonally. I am not ignorant that it is related how Ignatius the third bishop of Antioch after St. Peter, after seeing a vision of angels singing praise antiphonally to the Trinity, introduced this fashion into the church at Antioch, as Socrates relates (lib. vii. cap. viii.) and Basil (Ep. lxiii) to the clerks of Neocesarea. But Theodoret says that Flavian and Diodorus first divided the singers into two choirs to excite a holy emulation. But enough. The gospel was read first in Greek, then in Slavonic; and the emperor kissed it. And after the exclamation they began to sing the cherubic hymn, composed in the time of the emperor Justin, according to Cedrenus. And all the hierodiacons and the archimandrites who went round in the introit [that is, who were concelebrating], bearing the symbols of victory [the sacred vessels, and emblems of the passion], cried and proclaimed thus: 'Our heaven-crowned emperor, &c., Alexis Michaelovich, and the most religious Augusta, Maria Ilichna, and the princes and princesses [all by name], may the Lord remember for many years!' And the patriarch Kyr Paisius of Alexandria, receiving the holy δίσκος (the paten), imprecated suitable blessings on the emperor; and the patriarch of Moscow Kyr Joasaph, in like manner, taking the chalice, did the same.

Here many ask why this great introit is made with so much pomp, with lighted lamps, &c. Simeon of Thessalonica explains that it symbolises the second advent; and Germanus, very well, that it represents the procession from Bethany, as on this day.

After the end of the liturgy, Kyr Joasaph went out to bless the artificial fruit-tree above mentioned as loaded with hanging fruits (ἀκρόδρυα). And having made thence a suitable distribution to the palace, he gave the rest to us as a blessing. And we all went into the patriarchal banqueting-hall, into which the emperor did not enter on account of the fatigue of the procession. There were sent, however, dishes worthy of so great an emperor;

and so, having feasted and dined, we went out, after singing grace as usual, and having given and received the brotherly salutation.

Chap. XXIII. *How the holy μύρον was made; and some other occurrences of the Great Week.*

For a long time holy chrism had not been made in Moscow, *I know not why:* I suppose from ignorance of the right manner of making it,[36] and some difficulty in procuring the materials. And perhaps it was intermitted through *indolence* of the former *primates.* Therefore, having anticipated the want and foreseen the necessity, the two patriarchs stated to the emperor the need of this holy concoction; and he received the suggestion as coming from God, and ordered the requisite ingredients to be prepared and furnished abundantly. I confess I had not expected this work to be accomplished at once, because the ingredients are difficult to obtain and find, and costly, and so time is needed, and forethought; but I was agreeably disappointed.

The making of the myron belongs to the patriarch alone, according to canon vi. of the council of Carthage, which forbids any priest to make it. Dionysius the Areopagite, and Simeon of Thessalonica, and Pachymeres the scholiast on Dionysius enumerate the ingredients. . . . Ματλαῖα is from a Latin word signifying the measure or vessel measuring the oil-ladanum. Μάτουλα is the small hoe or stirring-iron; or a small tub, σκαφίδιον.

1. Κόμος is the aspalathus (a prickly shrub yielding a fragrant oil), or, according to Koressi the Sciote, it is what is called costus (an aromatic root), or the coriander, which grows bushy, and has a pleasant pungent taste and a fragrant smell. The hypericon is in Hellenic called barsamon (by the Cypriots it is called barsamiticon): it has leaves like the hazel, which dried have a sweet smell, and are very good for wounds. 2. The xerobalsamum is a fragrant shrub, and its juice, or the unguent obtained from it, is like the tear of the balsam. Opobalsamum, which grows much in Arabia, is very useful for ointments; it smells sweet like a rose, whence they call it ἡδύοσμος· its common name is sweet-smelling katzarus. 3. Echinanthe is the fragrant rush which Koressi writes σχοινάνθη (σχοῖνος being a rush), like the China rush which produces the medicinal

[36] Because they were without a patriarch?

mastic. 4. Pepper, both white and black, small and great. 5. Myrrh, commonly called *μετετζουβίον*, is well known; as is also 6. The styrax, which is very sweet-scented, and flows from the tree itself as a tear, like that of the quince. 7. The xylocassia, vulgarly called canella, is well known, the bark of which is thicker than cinnamon. 8. The Indian leaf called malabathron or nardus. 9. The carpobalsamum, the juice of which is like that of the opobalsamum, very sweet-scented: its seed tastes very sweet, and its fruit is agreeable. 10. The cyperon is a sweet-scented root vulgarly called *μαχαιρὶς*, *i. e.* sword-root. 11. Mizzococca are the seeds of the oxua-tree, which are glutinous like the *γοῦμα* of the oak-tree. 12. Κελτικὸν is the Celtic nard, which has a beautiful leaf and root, and is very fragrant. 13. The cassia called black is known, the fruit of which is like the *ξυλοκέρατον* and the rose otherwise called the xerocaryóphyllon: but if too much of this be put in, it spoils all the myron. 14. Cachris, commonly called rosemary. 15. Cinnamon, well known: its leaf is like canella. 16. Assaron, or wild nard, very fragrant. 17. Macarus or macerus, vulgarly maccos, or St. Thomas' wort. 18. Terebinth, or termanthus, is a well-known tree: its juice is sweet and like that of the *ῥητίνη*. It is called with us *τριμαντίνα*. 19. Potiton, or pepiton, is the *μοσχολάχανον*, in Latin moschalon (muscat); but the savants say it is the *μουσελέζιον*, the wine which Hippocrates so much loved. Koressi says it is the *πουζοῦν*, *i. e.* a compounded wine. 20. Myrobalanon is the *μυρεψικὴ βάλανος*, which some makers of myron used instead of olive-oil for costly unguents. 21. Ladanon, from the *κυπρίων* called xystarion, is well known: from this plant a dew attaches to the beards of the goats and sheep. 22. Stachys has white leaves, is very fragrant, and keeps its scent like the *ἀγριομάρουλλον* or *ϑρίδαξ ἀγρία*. 23. *Λίβανος* and *λίβανον* abounds on Lebanon, as it does on Antilibanus. 24. The *δενδρολίβανον*, and the *κικύβιρι* also called *τζιντζίβερι* (ginger?), in Latin zirodosia, with very fragrant seed and root. 25. *Ἄκορον*, an aromatic reed abounding on the shores of Pontus and Bithynia. 26. *Ἑλένιον*, a sweet root, in Latin inulla. 27. Aristolochia has a thick root, sweet bark, and is a stomachic: there are three sorts of it. 28. Iris, a sweet reed, which the Hebrews also used for their chrism, vulgarly called *σπαϑόκορτον*, *i. e.* sword-grass. 29. *Βόχος* or *βόλ-*

χος, a fragrant tear of a Saracenic tree in Saraia of Arabia. 30. Xylaloe or xylalas, or agallochon. 31. *Βαλσαμέλαιον* is the same as opobalsamum. In other Euchologia some other things are mentioned as ingredients. So the patriarchs took of these also, viz. narcissus, aspalathus, cassamon, galacas, &c. And enough of the ingredients.

Of old only the Pope of old Rome, according to the Westerns, made the myron, which he used to send to Constantinople. But according to the Easterns it was the patriarch of Antioch residing at Daphnae who sent it to Iberia. But on account of some jealousies and suspicions it was appointed that it should be made by all the patriarchs.

On the Great Monday all the herbs &c. were bruised and mixed together, and the oil was brought in and poured into the boiler (*κοκκάβιον*), and was measured to the requisite quantity, and the measures of wine were prepared. And the patriarchs, wearing their epitrachelion and omophorion, made the beginning, *Εὐλογητὸς ὁ θεὸς* κ.τ.λ. and, while the *Βασιλεῦ οὐράνιε* and the *Τρισάγιον* [the *Παναγία Τριὰς*] were saying, and the troparion and contarion of the day were being sung, the two patriarchs incensed crosswise. Then, taking a lighted lamp, they lighted the sticks under the boiler. Then their attendants arranged and spread the pyre [the wood under the boiler], the chief manager being Leontius the hegoumen of Cyprus. Then the reading of the four gospels began; and when the first boiling was done, the fragrant wine was poured in (*οἰνάνθη αὐτῇ σακκαλισθεῖσα*). And so the other ingredients, the libanum and the ladanum, the mastic, the patites, the styrax, were put in, and the like, and boiled on the Tuesday, and stirred on the Wednesday. And then the mixture was turned out of the great boiler and cooled, and put into the new vessels called nardia, or alabastra.

After the morrow, that is on the Great Thursday, the patriarch Kyr Joasaph came with the usual *λιτεία* to the Choudoff monastery; and the emperor followed with the grandees; and the *ἐκτενὴς* having been said, we went in order, singing, and entered into the church of the Blessed Virgin. And the vases (*κρατῆρες*), covered with sacred coverings, were set within the bema, after the washing and clothing of the holy table, against the time of the holy ceremony of the blessing (*ἁγιοτελεσιουρ-*

γίας). And at the great introit, when the gifts were brought in, the vases of myron were brought in too, covered. And after the consecration and the Καὶ ἔστω τὰ ἐλέη τοῦ μεγάλου Θεοῦ κ.τ.λ., the three patriarchs began to uncover the vases, and to sign them thrice. And Kyr Paisius, bending his head, said the first prayer, Κύριε τοῦ ἐλέους κ.τ.λ.; and Kyr Macarius the next, Σοὶ, τῷ Θεῷ κ.τ.λ. Then signing (σφραγίζοντες) them again, and covering the vases, and having poured the holy myron out from them into the proper receiving vessels in which it was to be kept, they finished the liturgy. While the communion anthem was singing, *the emperor entered within the altar to communicate.* But, O the warm repentance, and the spiritual inward boiling at that time at which the conscience, burning as a bush, showered off drops shining in the sun which ran streaming from his eyes! Ah, what groans from the depth of depths, heaved one after another, enough to soften a heart of adamant! &c. &c. Alas for us clergy, who, without a tear, approach the most awful table, who touch unholily the holy things, which should be given only to the holy and worthy. Of old St. Ambrose forbade Theodosius to enter the holy bema, though the emperor had long been used to enjoy the privilege prevalent from of old in the Byzantine church. Hence Valens, when he was about to offer the oblations in the great introit, was seized with giddiness as soon as he had entered the bema. And Matthew Blastar notices this privilege *in spite of the canons*, as of canon lxix. of the Sixth council. For this reason it is said that the emperors were ordained subdeacons; and that Kyr Theophilus of Alexandria so ordained the emperor Basil, after giving judgment on his difference with the patriarch John. And Simeon of Thessalonica rightly blames the Latins for having made the churches, and even the sanctuaries, accessible to all.

After the liturgy there was the washing of the feet of the bishops (τῶν ἀρχιερατικῶν πόδων), representing Christ's disciples, by Kyr Joasaph. But here do thou, O reader, *note* with me for a moment the *arrogance of Nicon*, who made the example of Christ to consist not in washing the feet of the disciples, but in sitting on the colt with βάϊα and boughs. And yet the Saviour of all commands not on occasion of the sitting, but on occasion of the washing, saying, 'Ye ought also,' &c. That is,

according to Theophylact, 'Ye have a more necessary duty to wash one another's feet, for humility;' because this seems to be one of the lowest offices of unlettered and ignorant servants, such as were the fishermen, the apostles, to wash feet. Which the first of the fishermen, Peter, considering, said: 'Lord, washest thou my feet?' &c. &c. But the representative of Peter now was Pitirim the senior metropolitan, who said this in Slavonic. And thence this most christian custom spread to every city and country; and especially it is practised at Jerusalem, where, on the arrival of pilgrims, their feet are immediately washed. But the Crusaders [the Knights of St. John], who now hold Malta, had this for their first duty and profession, to wash the feet of the strangers and pilgrims who came to the Holy Land. Our divinely-graced *emperor*, then, does after the example of Christ, when he goes about by night to the houses *of the bishops*, and *is zealous every year to perform this menial and dishonourable office of washing their feet;* not deputing the service to be done for him by any other, but doing all himself; putting the water into the basin, washing the feet, drying them with the towel with all zeal and humility; looking doubtless to the transcendental ministry of humility, which exalts instead of degrading the man who acts on it. But one may observe that in other places it is not the feet of *bishops*, but of twelve simple priests, that are washed. Why, then, is it done thus at Moscow, when every bishop is a type of Christ rather than of an apostle? I answer: That is when they are in their own dioceses, but not when they are assembled round their chief the patriarch, to whom they are subject. And the metropolitan ordained by a patriarch *is as a son*[37] *to his ordainer.*

After the washing and wiping of the feet, the vases (κρατῆρες) of the myron were distributed; and *one* alabastron *was given to the emperor*, another to *the local bishop and patriarch Kyr Joasaph*, a third to the heads of *the clergy of the great church;* and the rest were kept *for the two other patriarchs:* and then the λιτὴ followed, and only a short παράκλησις, on account of the fatigue of the preceding ceremonies.

Two other ceremonies were performed in the Great Week very worthy of attention. The one was the making of the com-

[37] Yet this was one of his reproaches against Nicon, that he treated them as his sons, rather than as brethren. See the *Replies of Nicon*, p. 61-64, 162.

mon εὐχέλαιον (oil for anointing the sick with prayer) on the Great Wednesday, if this be canonically done. For *some* say that James the brother of the Lord has left us a rule not to apply it to the bodies of such as are in health, but only to the sick, and such as have no hope of life and are all but expiring. The other [ceremony and] question was, whether on the Great Friday (when all else is suspended, and the saving passion of our Lord Jesus Christ is put forward alone to be contemplated) the water may rightly be blessed by the holy relics of saints and martyrs being put into the vessel (λεκάνη)?

To the first question I reply, that sickness is twofold, of soul and of body: and he who is sick in either way may be anointed with the oil of prayer (εὐχέλαιον) for the remission of lesser sins. Yet I do not deny that in the original and proper sense the euchelaion was designed for those who were suffering from some grave bodily malady, for bodily strengthening and restoration to health: but in a secondary and, as I may allow, an abusive sense, it is not forbidden that it should be used for those who suffer some spiritual evil; as bodily purgatives may be taken only as precautionary safeguards (προφυλακτικά).

As to the other question: The chief martyrs are associated with the passion of Christ. It is a tradition at Jerusalem, that for every drop of blood which fell from Christ while he was on the cross, a body in the tombs outside the gate arose, and went into the holy city to show that it was in truth [the Son of God who was crucified]. But as this was only for a sign, *they of course died again:* and thenceforth they were 'in the hand of God,' and no longer in Hades. So Theophylact on Matt. xxvii. 'Read,' he says, &c. But some say that after the resurrection of Christ *these also rose and died no more*, quoting the words, 'Thou hast led captivity captive,' &c. But I know not whether one ought to admit this (since *all* are to *rise again* at the last day).

On the morning of the Great Friday we all assembled in the great church; and putting on mourning and black robes, we went up into the church (τέμενος) of the Annunciation, where there were set out a vast number of sacred relics and treasures (ἀναθήματα) [*i.e.* precious reliquaries] for veneration. And having taken and kissed them, we went down with them, each of us carrying his reliquary, the emperor himself following behind

with the boyars. And while the great or holy hours were being sung, and the gospels were being read in Greek [the four gospels are read through on this day] by Kyr Paisius of Alexandria and Kyr Macarius of Antioch, and in Slavonic by Kyr Joasaph, and also by the metropolitan Pitirim, there began to be performed the great ἁγιασμὸς [blessing of the water] with the holy relics of the martyrs, from which ἁγιασμὸς very many vases (κρατῆρες) were filled, and kept with warm faith, to be used as salutary preservatives for divers diseases.

At the fixed hour for the vespers we went again to the great church; and there, having sung all the office, we went on to the vigil service. And after the ἀπόλυσις of the παννυχὶς we performed at dawn with a great procession the sacred ἐπιτάφιον [*i.e.* the representation of the burial of Christ].

And at the proper time, having finished the liturgy towards the evening on the Great Sabbath, we rested, still fasting. But, O most sacred Sabbath!—for I will address you as if you were a living thing,—how shall I relate thy memorable hymns? I, the worshipper of the holy sepulchre, not to say the most special suppliant and ambassador. On which Great Sabbath also the holy light, the symbol of the unsetting light, comes down from above, enlightening for ever the good, and accompanying the bad who are to be burned with fire unquenchable. May my tongue cleave to my throat if ever I forget thee, O all-holy city Jerusalem, my country, my soul, and my metropole! And why should I forget thee, which hast adorned me with the angelic habit, and hast received me affectionately into thine own bosom, and even raised me to the exalted degree of the episcopate, and to the eminence of the preachership in the thrice-happy patriarchate of Kyr Paisius? Yea, yea; let the names of the departed be ever honoured. For he that is dead is justified, according to St. Paul. Yea, yea; let the holy memory of my excellent benefactor be remembered for ever; of him who welcomed me, when I was a stranger, to the shrines of Jerusalem. For I greatly approve that saying, that we ought to engrave the favours and benefits we have received on retentive (στιγανῷ) marble for everlasting memory, but our wrongs and ill-treatment only on the dust, for a passing note of disregard, yea and of contempt, to perish like the flowers which blossom only for a day. [Then after celebrating the church of Jerusalem, and the pilgrimages made thither, and quoting Gre-

gory Nyssene, he exclaims:] Let *those*[38] go to Jericho who nonsensically say that the life-giving sepulchre, and Bethlehem, and Golgotha are everywhere: for at Jerusalem there are the originals, but elsewhere *only copies or symbols*, &c. &c.

Epilogue.

The Lord grant *us* to be as *Nico*demus, to *conquer* (νικᾷν) first in our heart the inner crowd of the passions of the flesh; and farther to emulate Joseph, who is interpreted '*addition*,' and to *add* by a continuous course of virtue spiritual steps and a ladder; and so to *take up* (αἴρειν) that which is good, as Joseph of Arimathea, taking up the light yoke of the cross. And may we receive the body of Christ, and place it as in a new tomb cut in the rock, that is, in the mnemonic part of the soul, and never forget God; and wrap it worthily in the linen cloth of a pure conscience, which is the garment of the soul; and embalm it with mixed myrrh and spices, and by no means reveal the mystery which is secret, &c. But, O blessed *Nico*demus, for of thee David sang, 'Blessed is the man,' &c., and thou *sattest not with them*, but *wast put in prison by them*, and *marvellously delivered*, and *didst preach the resurrection* to the *rulers* of the '*synagogue*,' and to the *high-priests Annas* and *Caiaphas*, and thou too, O most rich Joseph, and most prosperous merchant, who *didst buy*, in truth, *a field*[39] where was hidden the priceless treasure, the incomparable pearl, thou didst, in truth, do a praiseworthy deed when thou didst ask the body of Pilate . . . Truly *thou wert* a *good counsellor*, and a *man of the synclete* (συγκλητικὸς), and in deed and word distinguished (ἐπίσημος). No one of the apostles or disciples did this. Perchance they feared. But hadst not thou too reason to fear? But nothing great can be done without daring and risk. So with *Nico*demus, who (νικᾷ, that is, who conquers or) surpasses all in charity to strangers (φιλοξενίᾳ), thou didst [bury Christ]; and the Lord, who in life had not where to lay his head, in death is buried in the tomb of another; and,

[38] See the *Replies of Nicon*, p. 67-89.

[39] That field and treasure which neither tsar nor boyars, nor venal patriarchs and synods, could take from thee. For all this otherwise unmeaning verbiage has sense and force enough, if only instead of 'us,' who are now triumphing, the reader thinks of Nicon and of the final judgment, and on the resurrection and the new Jerusalem promised to the virtues of Smyrna and Philadelphia. Rev. ii. 8-11, and iii. 7-13.

being naked, is clothed by Joseph. These things we also ought [in some sense] to do, placing the memory [of Christ] in the chamber of our soul as in a tomb, imitating those good works of charity and mercy, mixing myrrh and aloes, the bitter and stringent thoughts of the judgment of that never-ending separation and just retribution (*δικαστήρια διχαστικὰ, μᾶλλον δὲ δικαιωτήρια, i.e.* tribunal of separation, or rather prison of just punishment); from which do thou spare and redeem us, O good Lord! Yea, we beseech thee; through the intercessions and prayers of thy saints, Joseph and Nicodemus,[40] who pleased thee. Amen. So be it!

Τέλος, καὶ Θεῷ δόξα.

[40] So this History of Paisius Ligarides, of which he tells the reader that it was written in a very short time, was finished at or about the date at which it ends, viz. Holy Saturday (6 Apr.) in A.D. 1667. The two patriarchs, however (whose restoration to their chairs was as yet uncertain), were kept on still at Moscow, Macarius of Antioch till 31 May 1668, and Paisius of Alexandria till 5 June 1669. As for Paisius Ligarides himself, though the tsar wrote to the patriarchs of Jerusalem Nectarius and Dositheus, to obtain his absolution and his restoration to the see of Gaza, and to the patriarch of C.P. also, Parthenius IV., to exert his influence for this same end, as well as for the restoration of the patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch to their chairs, *he* never returned to the Levant, but remained in Russia, no longer honoured as before (though he was for a short time employed as a professor at Kieff), but rather living under surveillance, till he died, as it is said, in A.D. 1678.

SUPPLEMENTARY

REFERENCES AND DOCUMENTS,

APPENDED BY THE TRANSLATOR TO PAISIUS' HISTORY OF THE SYNOD OF A.D. 1666.

I.

AT p. 30, where mention is made of the institution of the patriarchate of Moscow, note that in Nicon's *Replies*, &c. p. 47-54, the whole synodal act of the synod held at C.P. in A.D. 1593, as printed before by him in his *Skrijal* of 1655, is copied out. See also for those earlier acts which had preceded it, p. 14, 231, 656-659; and Mouravieff's *Hist. of the Russian Church*, p. 127-133, and the appendices, p. 289-345.

II.

At p. 31 mention is made of the consecration of the patriarch Philaret of Moscow by Theophanes patriarch of Jerusalem, in June A.D. 1619; and of the appointments of the other patriarchs of Moscow. See the *Replies*, &c. of Nicon, p. 15, 233, 659.

III.

At p. 73 mention is made of the *Thirty Questions* addressed by the boyar Simeon Luc. Streshneff to Paisius Ligarides, and of his *Answers* (12 July 1662). An abridgment of these is prefixed to the *Replies* of Nicon, p. xxvii. to xxxix. And interwoven with his *Replies* they are spread through the body of that work.

IV.

In connection with what is related at p. 74 may be inserted the following: '*Autograph letter to the Hossoudar the Tsar*,

&c. from Paisius metropolitan of Gaza: Of communicating to the œcumenical patriarch [i.e. to the primate, the patriarch of C.P., and to the other Eastern patriarchs] all that has passed respecting the patriarch Nicon, respecting whom there have been spread abroad among the people divers and momentous rumours. Also a petition from the same Paisius Ligarides, to be allowed to use the special Greek and Latin library collected by the Tsar [really by the patriarch Nicon], written June 7 (which was Whitsunday) *in* A.D. 1663.' [But from what Nicon writes at pp. 51 and 57 in his *Letter to Paisius Ligarides* it would appear that Paisius had already, before July 1662, written an earlier letter than this of 7th of June 1663 to the Tsar, and had in that letter also said something about the books collected by Nicon.]

Most serene and invincible emperor! Since to-day the tongues of fire are sent down upon us for the free will of sincere preaching and of apostolic truth, it will be well for us not to abuse such a most welcome benefit, but to turn it to as good account as possible by most religiously labouring and studying both for the exaltation of our holy mother the Church, and for the amplification of your most serene empire. And whereas it is acknowledged everywhere that public interests must take place of private, and ecclesiastical matters are preferred emphatically above civil, your most serene majesty, taking courage, may, we hope, be pleased to devote attention to all these interests, and by no means disdain to study especially those matters which seem conveniently to look and tend towards the public good, both ecclesiastical and political. Wherefore, since the patriarchal dignity outshines and overtops the rest, it is thought very unbecoming by all, both privately and publicly, that such a chair should for the space of four[1] whole years remain stripped of its honour. For it is a thing unheard of that a patriarchal church should so long, like the moon, be under eclipse, and be deprived of its legitimate pastor, as a widow who has lost her husband. For one may reason thus: Either the patriarch Nicon is burdened with crimes, and in that case he ought, as unworthy, to be synodically [judged to be] out of, not in [the chair], and punished (since crime is followed by its punishment): or, if he is by no means judged to be guilty, and seems to be open to no process of accusation, he will be able freely to return to his chair, discharged of

[1] Nearly five from Nicon's departure from Moscow in 1658.

all accusation; and so an end will be at length made of this so great contention (litigii). For all Muscovy throughout its whole extent has now been made a spectacle ['a reproach' in the Slav.] to the whole world, and the nations are all looking to see what is to be the winding-up, the crisis and catastrophe of this tragi-comedy ['tragic spectacle,' Slav.]. Besides, innocence will then become known, and the innoxious integrity of [one of the two] sides.[2] For a rumour is falsely circulated even to this day, that it was on account of imminent danger of being secretly slain, and on the revelation of a tyrannical conspiracy against him, that the patriarch Nicon took to flight. Which assertion, so nakedly made, certainly brands with no slight blot your most august empire, attaching to it the extreme reproach of parricide; and by this most foul wickedness first your most sacred majesty is wronged, then the council ['senatus;' in the Slav. 'the government,' *praviteľstvo*] and the people of Muscovy are blackened with the infamy of an abominable crime (piaculi), most unworthy to be committed even in thought [the Slav. is equivalent to 'infandâ infamiâ *mortalis peccati*, cujus vel sola cogitatio horrorem inducit]. For if it was a very great misdeed that the patriarch should have received even so much as a single blow from the emperor Basil when he was provoked by reproachful words, how enormously flagitious a crime would it not be to have sought and attempted to compass for the patriarch the last end of *most sweet* life! And though Theophilus patriarch of Alexandria, being called in at that time as a mediator to restore peace, is related to have confronted the adverse parties thus opposed to one another [in the form of two waxen images], and to have ordered that the tongue of the waxen image of the patriarch should be cut out, and that the hand of the emperor's effigy should be amputated (tolleretur de medio), on account of the cuff disrespectfully given by it, yet what pontiff can now be found to be a mediator and to intercede again and repeatedly for thee, the most christian emperor, the slayer of the patriarch Nicon (for the will in such a matter is taken for the deed rightly and deservedly)? O calumny, worthy to be punished by the everlasting flames of hell! O plague, to be plagued with eternal torments! ['O *luem*

[2] 'Insuper innotescet innocentia, partiumque integritas innoxia fiet manifesta,' &c. But the Slav. would be in Latin: 'Insuper necessarium est ostendere innocentiam et *impartialitatem*,' *i. e.* 'necessary for thee, O tsar, to show thine own innocence and impartiality.'

luendam æternis cruciatibus!' The Slav. has 'O obloquy or slander, worthy of endless torments!'] Is it thus, O Alexis, O man of God, that thou art known and accounted of by the judgments of foreigners on account only of Nicon, a man covered with thy benefactions, and overshadowed by the rays of thy clemency? But now I see that honey is turned into gall, and the choicest wine changed to vinegar, through an extraordinary mark of ingratitude [the Slav. more intelligibly puts simply 'by boundless ingratitude']. It remains therefore concluded that a mission should be dispatched as speedily as possible to the patriarch of C.P., in order that he, as the œcumenical patriarch [the Slav. has 'judge'], may be specially informed of the whole matter, so that he may be able to pronounce juridically [the Slav. has 'in canonical or regular order'] right judgment in so grave a matter, in which the public reputation [of your majesty and of the council and people of Russia] is greatly compromised ['ubi publica fama maximopere periclitatur.' The Slav. supplies 'of all the empire']. For it is said with reason, 'Omnia si perdas, famam servare memento;' and 'Fama, malum quo non aliud velocius ullum' ('Though you lose all beside, remember to keep your good fame;' and 'Evil fame is a mischief which flies and spreads more swiftly than any other'). The reference or appeal (relatio seu *ἀναφορὰ*) ought to be *composed* in *Greek*, that it may be the more easily understood without any need of trusting to another interpreter; and also that the secrets of your majesty may not be divulged among men who may be of various opinions and judgments. To have hinted this briefly is enough . . . We will say more, if your most clement majesty shall be pleased again hereafter to accept and read our lucubrations [annuerit iterum nostras lucubrationes recognoscere. The Slav. would be in Latin: 'annuerit vel dignata fuerit accipere meas repræsentationes nativâ vestræ imperialis majestatis benevolentiâ'] with thy royal benevolence, the spring zephyr of thy native benignity breathing favourably (regali benevolentiâ, spirante *Favonio* nativæ benignitatis).

Your most serene and most sacred majesty's most humble and devoted client, Paisius Ligarides metropolitan of Gaza, *m.p.* [*i.e.* with my own hand].

(*And together with the above, or as a postscript.*)

Most sacred and pious emperor! A garden shut up and a fountain sealed, if they both are prevented from ministering abundantly their fruits to the hungry and their waters to the thirsty, are rightly and deservedly considered to be no better than if they did not exist. To what purpose do I instance these? It has become known to me for some time past, by fame, that your most serene majesty had obtained from various libraries a selection of valuable books. Therefore I beg and earnestly petition that I may be allowed free access to examine and use those books (codices), both Latin and Greek. And this will most certainly profit and not hurt the holy Church of God as well as your most august empire, which may the Divine Providence ever protect, exalt, and confirm. Amen! So be it! so be it!

Your most serene and most clement majesty's most humble beadsman (orator) and most devoted [slave] for all services (*ad omnia*. These two words are omitted in the Slavonic), Paisius Ligarides metropolitan of Gaza, *m.p.*

On the other side is the address thus: 'To thee alone, the most serene Emperor, my most christian lord and patron.' (*Roumantseff*, vol. iv. p. 119-121, *State Papers*, &c.)

V.

At p. 75 mention is made of *Twenty-five Questions* based on the preceding *Thirty Questions* of the boyar Streshneff, and sent at the suggestion of Paisius Ligarides, by the hand of his friend and fellow-countryman Meletius, to the Eastern patriarchs, Meletius being instructed also to give them oral information, with suggestions how to word the answers so as best to suit the purpose in view. These Questions and Answers are printed in Greek and Slavonic in Roumantseff's *Collection*, &c. as follows:

Answers of the four œcumenical patriarchs to Twenty-five Questions touching the power of the Tsar (i.e. emperor or king), that it is unlimited; and the power of the Patriarch, that it is limited; occasioned by the judicial trial that was preparing concerning the Russian patriarch Nicon: with an appendix of the personal opinion of the patriarch of Jerusalem Nectarius,—that every patriarch

may be judged and deposed by bishops and metropolitans. 1663, *May.*[3]

(The Tome of certain necessary questions, the answers to which have been made by the four most holy and most blessed patriarchs, and put forth, after having been weighed according to the definitions and canons of the Catholic and Apostolic Eastern Church, in the form of Questions and Answers, A.D. 1663, in the month of ——.)

In the name of the Father unbegotten and unoriginated, of the Son begotten and originated, and of the Holy Ghost originated and proceeding from the Father only, the all-holy and blessed and life-giving, undivided and unconfused and imperial Trinity, the one in nature, the only God, from which every good benefit and every perfect gift is communicated to the creation:

(*Exordium.*) To begin from God and to rest on God is what the voice of the Divine inculcates on those who are about to engage in any matters which are to conduct to the salvation of souls and to the conservation of ancient customs. For every matter thence begun arrives at a conclusion profitable and well-pleasing to Him. And the most prophetic Solomon, by writing as he does, 'In the much multitude of counsel there is understanding,' gives us to understand how very profitable is the counsel that is drawn from the holy canons, and the understanding that is collected from the divine fathers. For by the concurrence of many counsellors the unintelligent opinion which was unperceived and was lurking underneath is destroyed, and there springs forth the intelligent common counsel, as a panoplied warrior with shield and spear forcibly solving every doubt. Who then can doubt but they who begin from God and rest on God will, by the concurrence of many and good counsels, obtain those ends after which they aim? Therefore, having this con-

[3] It was not till 7th June 1663 that Paisius Ligarides wrote his letter to the Tsar (see his *History*, p. 74, and No. IV. above); and the Questions addressed subsequently, in consequence of his advice, to the patriarchs were, according to him, sent off 1st January 1664. But the 'codicil' of Nectarius patriarch of Jerusalem, attached to the patriarchal tome, is dated February 1664; and it was received at Moscow, together with the tome previously subscribed by him as well as by the other three patriarchs, and together with his separate letter of 20th March, in May 1664. Paisius' date then, of Jan. 1, A.D. 1664, for the sending off of Meletius with the XXV. Questions, cannot be right. Perhaps he should have written 'on the new year, 1st *Sept.*' *i.e.* in A.D. 1663.

fidence, as worshippers of God, and taking our stand on the common counsel of the apostles, and the canons and the sentences of the synods, we will give their proper answers to the Questions proposed, aiming above all things at the spiritual benefit to be obtained through the same.

It is to be observed that the name of *tome* is given to the sentence or decision made by the synod on any matter [from the verb τέμνειν] because it *cuts* or *decides* all doubts, and solves the questions brought forward; as also νόμος (law) is so called [from νέμω] because it awards (νέμει) to each man the right which belongs to him, and discriminates and makes the true distinction and partition in that which seems confused and difficult to distinguish. [Observed by Paisius Ligarides?]

Chap. I.—*Question.* What is a king or emperor (βασιλεύς)?

Answer. From the great Νόμιμον (book of the laws, or Nomocanon) of the great church, ch. v. § 2.

'A king or emperor is lawful government (or authority governing by law), a common good to all the subjects, neither doing good to any from *partiality* nor hurt from antipathy, but according to the merits of them that are ruled, like an umpire in the games, distributing the prizes impartially, and not bestowing *new* benefits of favour to *some* to the *detriment of others*:' [*i.e.* it was not right to bestow on Nicon, whether as metropolitan of Novgorod or as patriarch, unprecedented favours of *powers* or *titles*, to the *lowering of the nobles*].

Gloss. 'The king or emperor, as the head and apex of all, ought to be beneficent towards all the members subject to him, and neither, yielding to any partiality of affection, confer benefits on the undeserving, nor be carried away to do hurt to them that deserve honour by any passion or dislike: but as a worker of justice, setting aside all passion, he ought to apportion as a judge to all their recompenses according to their deserts, and not to favour individuals, nor confer on them any *new* or *unusual* favours, of which they who are so unduly honoured *to the prejudice of others* taking advantage, use the same, it may be, to *cause confusion and disorder*, and *to oppose their benefactor*. [In the Slav., after 'favours,' the words are: 'who are improperly honoured, and use what they have so obtained to the detriment of others and to dishonour and oppose their benefactor.'] For

this cause kings *ought to see* that they *give not their own* glory *to another*, nor do *anything unprecedented* in the way of conferring favours, according to the scripture, which says: 'Give not thy glory to another, lest thou stir up against thyself a nest of hornets' [in the Slav. 'bees which produce no honey'].

Law. 'The *aim* of the king is the preservation and security by goodness' [*i.e.* by such means as goodness may use] 'of the forces remaining and actually belonging to him, and the recovery by watchful attention of whatever has been lost, and the acquisition, through wisdom and just methods and management, of what has not yet been acquired. The *end* of the king is to benefit his subjects; wherefore also he receives the title of εὐεργέτης (benefactor) in a special sense; and if he fails to be beneficent, he seems to falsify, according to the ancients, the royal character. The king ought, therefore, to be most prominently distinguished [ἐπισημότατος: in the Slav. 'high or lofty,' *i.e.* above all, not eclipsed by any subject; but the natural sense of the Greek is 'distinguished above all for his virtues'], and renowned for his zeal towards God.'

Gloss. 'Hence it is collected that the king or emperor is lord of all his subjects, since they all who obey him receive from him benefits, and they who in any way whatever resist him receive punishments, even though the man who resists him should chance to be also the local ecclesiastical primate;[4] for he beareth not the sword in vain, but for the praise of them that do well [in the Slav. 'who *serve*,' *i.e.* who serve *him* 'well'], and for the punishment of the evildoers. For he is the minister of God to execute vengeance. Wherefore also it is written: Fear God, honour the king; and, Pray for kings.'

CHAP. II.—*Question.* Are then simply all, and especially the local bishop or patriarch, to submit to and obey the ruling king or emperor in all *civil*[5] matters and causes, so that there may

[4] Lit., 'the same who in that place or region is ecclesiastically foremost.' In the Slav. 'even though it should be any ecclesiastic exceeding all others in place,' *i.e.* in rank.

[5] κατὰ πάσας τὰς πολιτικὰς ὑποθέσεις καὶ κρίσεις· but in the Slav. as printed 'po razumu i veshchi blagodostoini,' which might be in Greek κατὰ λόγον καὶ εὐπρεπεῖς ὑποθέσεις, so as to omit entirely the important word 'civil,' πολιτικὰς, and this too after the first and grosser falsification, which seems to have consisted in the simple omission of the word πολιτικὰς, had provoked opposition from some of the Russian bishops after the condemnation of Nicon in the synod of 1666.

be only one lord and leader? or is it not to be so? [In the Slav. 'Thus, is there to be one single principle of authority, or not?']

Answer. In ch. lxiv. of the great Nomimon there is inserted, from the tome of the writing (ἐγγραφῆς) of the most holy œcumenical patriarch Kyr Michael addressed to the then emperor Kyr Manuel, what follows: 'Rightly to worship God in the first place, and *after* that[6] to honour the emperor, and to keep faith sincerely to both, is a law which has been absolutely laid down from of old for all men who are pious towards God. And these two being the supreme objects of all human honour, in those things to which the commandment of the fidelity owing to them properly belongs (for what God is in heaven and in all things and creatures, the same on earth, after God, is the imperial preëminence and dignity in the territories, things, and persons which are under its dominion), we judge that just as he who denies the faith in God is banished from the assembly of the orthodox, so he who abjures his fidelity to the power of the emperor, and is treacherously and disloyally disposed [Slav. 'shows himself malicious and false'] towards it, is unworthy to be called a Christian; since he who wears the crown, the authority, and the diadem is also a christ, or anointed one, of the Lord. Since then these things are so, we are undeniably bound, every one of us, to keep a *godly* fidelity [ἔνθεον, but in the Slav. 'a *true* fidelity'] to our potent emperor for ever.' And, after a little more: 'We synodically now ordain and define that for the future all who are raised to the *eminence* [Slav. 'dignity'] of the high-priesthood, that is to say, the most holy patriarchs, shall also give the same[7] engagement as security of their fidelity to the potent emperor as they each give of their orthodox sentiments respecting God.' See the form of the *profession of the patriarch*, with what respect [εὐλαβείας· in the Slav. 'honour'] it is worded; and consider exactly its words and its meaning: 'I engage by this my present act in writing to observe towards thee, the potent emperor, sincere fidelity and loyalty, as I owe

---

See Paisius' *History*, p. 207, &c., and the amusing attempt of the same Paisius to shift the charge from himself upon the *blundering* translators who translated *his Latin* translation into Slavonic.

[6] The Slav. instead of 'but *after* that,' μετὰ δὲ, has merely 'likewise,' '*taje*.'

[7] But it is τὴν αὐτῶν in the text, which makes no sense. The Slav. avoids the difficulty by omitting the words κατ' αὐτὸν, and leaving the proper object of orthodox faith to be implied.

this both of natural and of legal duty; and to be [obedient] to the determination and will and command of thy majesty (*βασιλείας*) against every man who contravenes this present oath.' And, after a little more, saying that he extends the sense of the oath not only to the emperor himself, but also to the empress, and to their imperial children, he continues: 'And if it so be that thou payest the common debt of all men, I engage that I will from thenceforth, without any sort of doubt or need of any other oath, show the same sincere fidelity and unfeigned loyalty towards the beloved son of thy majesty.' And after a little more: 'And, *saving* [Slav. 'having manifested'] my fidelity and loyalty to him and the honour of thy majesty, I profess that I will be obedient to the determination and will and command of the beloved consort of thy sacred majesty the empress [lit. *Αὐγούστης*].' And a little farther on: 'And again I profess that I will be obedient to the determination and will and command of thy majesty; and I will do as thy majesty may command whether by word or writing, whether it be concerning thy beloved daughter the most illustrious princess and him who is to be her husband, or concerning any other arrangement (*οἰκονομίας*) which shall be *decreed*[8] by thy majesty. And if any question or doubt arise, whatsoever it be, I will address myself to the solution of the same, according to the determination of thy majesty. And I engage to observe all this by this my written act entirely and without qualification, without guile or duplicity of any kind, or any evasive interpretation. So may God be propitious to me!' Hence it results that the king or emperor is lord and arbiter of every *political* matter alone,[9] and that the patriarch is subject to him, as being in superior authority, and the executor (or executing minister) of God; and that it is by no means lawful for him to will or to do anything or to act in political matters in opposition to the judgment

[8] *ὁρισθησομένης*: but the Slav. has 'which I shall be charged to execute,' 'quod mihi commiseris peragendum.'

[9] Κύριον καὶ ἐξουσιαστὴν παντὸς πολιτικοῦ πράγματος μόνον κ.τ.λ. But in the printed Slav. this place also, like the similar one noticed above, was garbled by simply leaving out the word '*political*' in the first instance; and when that was too much for some of the Russian bishops, the present translation as it stands now printed was substituted, which translates thus: 'that the tsar alone is hossoudar (lord) and the exerciser of lordship (or arbiter) over everything that is *well-pleasing* [to God? or to himself?]; but that the patriarch is to be obedient to him, as being in the higher dignity.'

of the emperor, nor in ecclesiastical matters to go about[10] to remodel the old orders and customs, and introduce new services into the church, or call in question and abrogate the forms of the sacred liturgies [so as to vary from] those which are authorised and enjoined by the canons, viz. those of St. John Chrysostom, and of Basil the Great, and that of the Presanctified. But he must observe towards the emperor upright fidelity; and towards the ecclesiastical traditions and customs he must have an unchanging judgment, and must by no means *introduce any novelties* in them. If he does otherwise, and shows himself presumptuous (*ἀπαυθαδιαζόμενον*) either towards the emperor or towards the ecclesiastical constitutions, we declare that he loses his dignity, so that he is not only no longer to be called a bishop, but he is not even to be called a Christian (*ἐκπίπτειν τῆς ἀξίας, ὥστε οὐ μόνον ἀρχιερέα, ἀλλ' οὐδὲ Χριστιανὸν λέγεσθαι*). For this shows that he is not to be named [a Christian] from Christ, that he *disturbs* [in the Slav. 'rejects and angers'] the christ of the Lord [*i.e.* the tsar, the Lord's anointed].

CHAP. III.—*Question.* Is it right that in like manner as it is necessary that the patriarch should give an engagement [of fealty] to the emperor in writing, so he should also *seek from him a written [engagement]?*

Answer. The apostle cries aloud: 'Let all things be done in order.' But what order would be kept, if the patriarch also were to seek from the emperor a written engagement, though it were even about the smallest matter? For the emperor or king (*βασιλεὺς*) being the *basis* of the (*λαῶν* or *λεῶν*) peoples, there will so be two principles in one monarchy rivalling one another, whence strife will certainly ensue. For where there are two principles of authority not in subordination one of them to the other, but mutually independent, there also there is strife [in the Slav. 'enmity and scandal']; there also there is ruin. Wherefore also the unerring mouth of Christ said: 'Every rule (or principality, *ἀρχὴ*) which is divided into parts (*μεριζομένη*) within itself shall be destroyed.' So that to ask for such a thing[11]

[10] *βουλεύεσθαι καὶ*· but should not *καὶ* be *ὥστε*? In the Slav. it is 'nor in ecclesiastical affairs to wish and to change,' as if it had been *βούλεσθαι*.

[11] Such, that is, as Nicon asked for; first a *promise of obedience in spiritual things* by word of mouth, and then later *a written enactment to abrogate or limit certain parts of the Code.*

is a sign of treachery and disloyalty,[12] and the act of a man secretly *plotting against peace*. And such a one *ought to be cast out and banished* (ἀποσκορακίζεσθαι), *as an insurgent against the imperial power* (ὡς τῇ βασιλείᾳ μαχόμενον. In the Slav. 'is to be cast out as one that is warring against the tsar's throne'). This may be collected also from tit. lx. of the imperial book of the Laws (Νομίμου, *i.e.* the Basilica), viz. that by no manner of means has the primate of the church liberty (ἄδειαν) to seek a promise from the emperor. For no liberty has been given to them that preside *spiritually*[13] to seek for promises from him who rules *politically* in any matter *whatsoever*, that the unity [of rule] may not be found divided into two, nor that ruin which would be the consequence of this ensue.

CHAP. IV.—*Question.* Can any one, being bishop in any eparchy, *ask* from the emperor to *exercise lordship* in the same?

Answer. The Attaliote, in lib. i. ch. 109, says: 'If any bishop, being in possession of an eparchy, *ask* of the emperor to *rule* in his own eparchy, he incurs the guilt of sacrilege, *unless* indeed it be the emperor who of his own will *makes him to be a ruler*.'

CHAP. V.—*Question.* Is that which has been decreed by the emperor law? and has it binding authority?[14]

Answer. The Attaliote, in lib. i. ch. 54, says: 'That which shall seem good to or that which shall please the emperor is law, whether he enacts it by a writing bearing his signature, or judicially gives sentence, or after consideration notifies and publishes his pleasure. And all these different forms are called ordinances.[15] But in a stricter sense than the others those laws which are dogmatically published, and which treat methodically and make definitions on certain subjects [as those of the *Code*] are called

[12] δόλου καὶ ὑπουλότητος. In the Slav. 'from the tsar, is a sign of malice or roguery, and an act of shamelessness, of impudence.'

[13] τοῖς προϊσταμένοις πνευματικῶς ζητεῖν ὑποσχέσεις παρὰ τοῦ ἡγεμονεύοντος πολιτικῶς, 'to them that rule *spiritually* to seek promises from him that rules *politically*.' But in the Slav. 'to spiritual people (*i.e.* ecclesiastics) of authority, *i.e.* dignified clerks, to exact promises (lit. vows) from him who has lordship in the world:' and, at the end, instead of 'that ruin,' &c. '*sedition and scandal*.'

[14] καὶ ἔχει τὸ κῦρος, *i.e.* the *Oulojenie* or *Code*, and its provisions *for lay people to exercise jurisdiction over all the clergy*.

[15] διατάξεις· in the Slav. 'v*rouchk*enia,' from '*man*data' of Paisius, no doubt.

ordinances' [*διατάγματα*, 'ordinationes.' In the Slav. 'vrouchenia i chini,' *i.e.* 'mandata *et* ordinationes']. Hence it may be collected that no one has any sort of liberty to oppose the emperor's injunction (*ἐπιτάγματι*); for it is law [in the Slav. 'for it is *of itself* law']. Nor he who is ecclesiastically chief, whether it be a patriarch or one of any other grade. Wherefore any one who opposes the injunction or the letters of the emperor shall be punished as acting contrary to law [in the Slav. 'as a transgressor of the laws'].

CHAP. VI.—*Question.* Can a bishop, or a patriarch, or any other ecclesiastic, whatever title he may have, excommunicate whom they please for personal matters of their own?[16] And are those who have been so excommunicated bound [*ὑπαιτίους*, *i.e.* bound by the excommunication; in the Slav. 'abominable or hateful'] before God? And is he who excommunicates unreasonably subject to canonical penalties? [*καὶ εἰ ὁ ἀφορίζων ἀλόγως ὑπαίτιος ἐστὶ τοῖς κανόσι*; in the Slav. 'Or is he who excommunicates without a true judgment obnoxious to the canons?']

Answer. Can. xxxvii. of the synod of Carthage says: 'Likewise it is agreed that so long as his own bishop does not communicate with him that is so excommunicated, the same bishop is not to be communicated with by other bishops, that the bishop may be the more cautious not to utter [such an excommunication] against any one.' And Zonaras, glossing this canon, says: 'As long as that bishop does not communicate with the man excommunicated, neither shall the other bishops communicate with that one who so excommunicates. And the reason is given, that the bishops may not be hasty and inconsiderate to accuse and to excommunicate, and may not say against any one what they cannot prove.' And Balsamon: 'By this canon the bishop who unreasonably excommunicates is thus punished. But I am of opinion that not only is such a bishop [by the canons] to be punished, but also that when this unreasonable excommunication has been uttered, he who has been excommunicated is to be loosed [*i.e.* declared free from any bond] before a superior [hier-

[16] *i.e.* As Nicon may have excommunicated Khitroff, Pitirim, Streshneff, Sitin, or Babarikin. See the *Replies*, &c. (Quest. xxii. of the xxx.) pp. xxxi. 154, 156, 157-172.

arch], and he who has excommunicated him is to be punished according to the Novell of Justinian. Novell of the emp. Justinian: "We forbid all the bishops to separate any man from the holy communion before some cause be shown for which the ecclesiastical canons order that so it should be: and if any one without any such [canonical] cause shall separate or excommunicate any man, the same man, as being unjustly separated, being loosed by the superior hierarch shall obtain the communion, but he who had unjustly separated him from it shall be excommunicated by that superior priest [*i.e.* the hierarch] to whom he is subject; that he may justly suffer the same penalty which he had unjustly inflicted." According then to this Novell also he is to be punished.'

Farther gloss of the same Theodore Balsamon, patriarch of Antioch: 'So that he who is excommunicated not for any cause specified (as incurring that penalty) by the divine canons, but by the inconsiderate will of the bishop excommunicating, shall safely disregard the excommunication; and he rather who has excommunicated him shall incur punishment. For if liberty were to be given to the bishops to excommunicate seasonably or unseasonably alike, and to force those whom they censured to fear an unseasonable excommunication, the bishops might presume even to the setting up of a tyranny, and might trample under foot piety, and the canons might become the occasion of many evils; there is no extremity of confusion and mischief which might not be the result.' And from St. Dionysius the Areopagite, from his consideration of the mystery in the case of those who have fallen asleep in holiness, it is to be collected that if the hierarch excommunicates any man contrary to the intent of God, the divine power does not follow him: 'Thus also the hierarchs hold their powers of excommunicating as exponents of the divine judgments: not as if the all-wise power of God, to say it without irreverence, followed ministerially their unreasonable impulses, but so that they, by the sacramental Spirit suggestively moving them, excommunicate deservedly those that are condemned by God.' And the blessed Synesius, writing to Theophilus, says of such cases: 'The divine power follows not unreasonable impulses.' And from the Laws: 'If any one curses or excommunicates a man unreasonably, not only does it not affect that man, but the curse returns upon his own head.' And the divine word

says, 'Pray, and curse not.' For the power of binding and loosing given by the Saviour to the priests is not ready at once (or absolutely) to bind and to loose according to their view, but only as is pleasing to God. Nor is it lawful for them of their own wills to loose or to bind, but only for the causes enacted by the canons. Whence it is collected respecting the bishops who unreasonably [in the Slav. 'and shamelessly'] curse or excommunicate any man, that they not only cause the curse and the excommunication to return back upon themselves, but they also deserve punishment for angrily and inconsiderately of their own will separating from the common body of the Church some of those whom the Saviour redeemed with his own precious blood, and that they are to be deposed from the episcopal chair, according to the divine canons. And if there is no allowance made for an unreasonable curse or excommunication of any common person, much less certainly is there in the case of princes and of those who have intrusted to them [that is, from God] the power of government [in the Slav. 'of eminent persons,' that is, of *boyars* and *bishops*].

CHAP. VII.—*Question.* Since it was said above that he who has been excommunicated by a priest, upon being loosed by the superior priest is to obtain communion, may one here understand the word 'priest' to signify bishop and metropolitan? and in like manner the word 'bishop' to signify metropolitan and patriarch? or not?

Answer. The word 'priest' is a general name in the canons, and is used to signify both priest and bishop. For when the canons say that he who has been unjustly separated by a priest from communion is to be loosed by the superior priest, the word 'priest' in the first place means either a priest or a bishop, but in the second place the same word means either a bishop, or a metropolitan, or a patriarch. So also the word 'bishop' is used both for a bishop in the general sense and for a metropolitan and a patriarch. When the canons say, 'If any bishop be tried on any charges, and it be so that the bishops around him do not agree,' &c., *it is understood*[17] that the bishop first named is a metropolitan or patriarch, but the bishops named afterwards are

[17] So it was *not* understood *by Nicon* certainly. See his *Replies*, &c. Quest. xi. of the xxx. pp. xxviii., 59, 60, 670.

either suffragan bishops if the bishop tried be a metropolitan, or metropolitans if the bishop tried be a patriarch. And it cannot be said here that the metropolitan or that the patriarch is not subject to the synod about him, so as to be judged by the bishops who are around him [*i.e.* in his own province or patriarchate] because it is not said expressly by the canon 'metropolitan' or 'patriarch,' but 'priest' and 'bishop.' So then this pretext cannot be laid hold of by him who is locally the ecclesiastical primate, whether metropolitan or patriarch, nor justify him in saying that he is not subject to the judgment of the bishops who are about him. But *if he were to make an appeal* respecting the charges brought against him, the [final] decision must be received from the chair of Constantinople. And if the other patriarchs also be consentient, there remains no longer any room for pretending [to anything farther] respecting the charges made against him [*ἐὰν δὲ περὶ ὧν ἐγκαλεῖτο ἔκκλητον καλέσῃ, ἀπὸ τοῦ θρόνου τῆς Κωνσταντινουπόλεως τὴν ἀπόφασιν ἐκδεκτέον.* In the Slav. 'But if he who is accused of any crimes makes a perenesenie, relationem, translationem, of the cause,' *i.e. appeals* to the highest tribunal, this highest tribunal is the chair of Constantinople, from which the final judgment is to be awaited. And if the other patriarchs also agree with the patriarch of C.P., there remains no longer any place for any farther defence (ochischenia, *i.e.* purgationis, *προφάσεως*) respecting the charges brought against him].

CHAP. VIII.—*Question.* Is the chair of Constantinople intrusted with the judgment of all causes of other churches? and is it from that chair that every ecclesiastical question must obtain its final settlement?

Answer. This privilege *belonged* formerly [*ἦν*· but in the Slav. 'was *given*'] to the Pope of Rome before he was rent off [or 'split himself off,' or 'separated'] from the Catholic Church by arrogance and voluntary malice [*πρὸ τοῦ διαῤῥαγῆναι τῆς καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας ὑπὸ ἀλαζονείας καὶ ἐθελοκακίας.* But in the Slav. 'was separated or excommunicated (otlouchisia) from the Catholic Church on account of his proud and evil will']. But he being now split off [*διαῤῥαγέντος*], all the causes of the churches are referred to the chair of Constantinople, and receive from it their decision, as that chair has equal (*τὰ ἴσα πρεσβεῖα,*

'the same or equal') privileges, according to the canons, with those of the elder Rome. For canon iv. of the council of *Sardica* says: 'If any bishop shall have been deposed by the judgment of the bishops who are in the same parts, and says that he still undertakes to defend himself, he is not otherwise to be restored to his chair than if the bishop of Rome shall first have taken cognisance of the case, and shall issue a decree to this effect.' But that this privilege has been transferred to the œcumenical chair (the chair of C.P.) one may learn from many sources; and especially from the scholia of the great *Νόμιμον* (or Nomocanon), which say: 'On the strength of this canon the Romans (*ἐκ τούτου τοῦ κανόνος τὸ Ῥωμαϊκὸν ἦρται εἰς ἀλαζονίαν*) have lifted themselves up to arrogance; and their (*τούτων*) bishops in old time putting this canon forward *as if*[18] it were a canon of the Nicene council, were detected and exposed in the synod of Carthage as falsifiers (*ἐάλωσαν κακοῦργοι*), as the preface of that synod of Carthage of itself shows.' And lower down: 'Going upon this canon, the bishops of the elder Rome boast that all the appeals of the churches are committed to them.' And, continuing, he says: 'It does not give to him *all* the appeals of the bishops, but those of the eparchies subject to him, which (he says) afterwards were subjected to the bishop of Constantinople, so that it is to him also that their appeals thenceforth belong.' And from Balsamon: 'What was decreed concerning the Pope are not peculiar and exclusive privileges of him alone, but they are to be understood to belong also to the bishop of Constantinople; and the bishop of Rome being now split off from the Catholic Church, they are to be found now only with the œcumenical chair [*i.e.* the chair of Constantinople. *μόνον εἰς τὸν οἰκουμενικὸν ἀναφαίνονται θρόνον*]. And if the rest of the patriarchs also are consentient, if so be that any case be of great magnitude, the decision which has been pronounced will be irreversible.' [See Nicon's *Replies*, &c. p. 57, 644, 666.]

CHAP. IX.—*Question.* But it may be said that in consequence of the patriarchates being comprised within [the empire

[18] *οἱ* in the Greek by a blunder, which has been communicated to the Slavonic, and makes it to be without sense. It should be *ὡς*, *i.e.* *ὡς οὖσαν, τῆς ἐν Νικαίᾳ συνόδου κ.τ.λ.* Paisius may also have *latinised* a little in his translation, which seems to have run thus: 'et hunc canonem patres Nicæni concilii proponentes

of infidels], and being now under the yoke [*περιλῃφθῆναι, καὶ εἶναι ὑπὸ ζύγον*· but in the Slav. 'have been reduced to bondage by the infidels, and are under the yoke'], they have no longer their former honour, nor authority to decree and to judge ecclesiastical causes as aforetime.

Answer. From the great *Νόμιμον* of the great church, according to the judgment of the divine fathers, after much else, it is thus written: 'For this cause, as it seems, it has been prescribed (*προτετύπωται*) that there should be unquestionably promoted successors to all those patriarchs also who are not in possession of the most holy chairs allotted to them owing to the incursions of the heathens. For though they have been thrust out from the glory of their chairs, still the spiritual grace, according to David, shall not wax old. For our God shall come rather the more manifestly, and shall not keep silence: and He shall gather together to him his saints who have kept his covenant. For it is ordered by the canons that these are to be comforted, and thought worthy of all care and acceptation (*ἀποδοχῆς*), but by no means ['of derision and reviling' in the Slav.] that they are to be dishonoured on account of the anomalous state of circumstances.' If, then, at that time, even when they were actually excluded from their chairs, canons were made that they should be accounted worthy of all honour, and they have now by the grace of Christ recovered their chairs [or free access at least to the sites connected with them], how shall their sentence and judgment concerning every ecclesiastical matter be refused? Hence therefore it is collected by the common judgment [of us all] that *those of the bishops* [in the Slav. 'those *primates*'] who say that because the patriarchs are under a slavish yoke and are straitened, they have not the honour and worth [Slav. 'dignity and glory'] and authority of the patriarchate equally as if they were free, and [Slav. 'on that account'] do not acknowledge their ecclesiastical decision made according to the canons, *are to be punished*, as opposers of the divine will, and *living* only by the senses, and understanding nothing beyond, and *are to be deposed* from their own ranks. One may find scattered about in one

olim pro Carthaginiensi synodo acceperunt primatum gerentes tunc temporis [leaving out altogether the word *τούτων*, *i.e.* Romanorum] publicè, utpote intelligi potest ex præfatione synodica ejusdem Carthaginiensis synodi,' &c.

place or another very many clear testimonies to the honour of these [patriarchal chairs].[19]

CHAP. X.—*Question.* Is it permitted to whoever will, whether patriarch, or metropolitan, or bishop, to *give himself* in writing any titles which may please him *of arrogance*, and to corrupt the title given canonically to him, or to style and write himself Effendi[20] [αὐθέντης in the Greek, 'hossoudar' in the Slav.], when this title specially belongs to the civil rulers [ἡγεμόσιν· 'to secular *kniazes*' or princes in the Slavonic, which would include also many of the Russian nobles]?

Answer. From the great Νόμιμον of the great church in s. XXX.: 'Then when the divine and holy writings and the traditions of the fathers name the bishops of Alexandria *pope*, and the bishops of Constantinople and of Jerusalem *archbishop*, and the bishop of Antioch alone *patriarch*, how is it that the church of Antioch does not feel herself wronged when she learns that the rest also are styled patriarchs? certainly it is because of the identity of the honour belonging to them all.' And a little farther on: 'But since some say there is nothing to prevent those also who are bishops in any other place from being thus honoured and magnified, since they too have been found worthy of the dignity of teaching, and like Moses and Aaron stand in the holy of holies, we say that by the divine and sacred canons to the patriarchs alone are divided after an honorary way the climes of the habitable world (*πιφιλοτίμηται τῆς οἰκουμένης τὰ κλίματα*). And hence neither can any other, of his own right, take to himself any district [ἐνορίαν, *i.e.* 'parish,' 'eparchy,' or 'diocese' in the Western sense of this word; in the Slav. it is 'eparchy'], or any other privilege; but he sacerdotally executes that *part* and that *part* only of the ministry[21] which has been given to him from the divine great-

[19] The raskolniks did indeed thus impugn the authority of the Greek patriarchs of their time. But the *primate* Nicon did *not*. *He* only retorted their own argument on those who pretended that he had fallen from the patriarchate, and even from the priesthood, because he had withdrawn from Moscow to Voskresensk, which was in his own diocese. See the *Replies*, &c. (Question xviii. of xxx.), p. xxix. 96, &c. and Paisius' *History*, &c. p. 184, 192.

[20] See the *Replies*, &c. (Question xiii. of the xxx.), p. xxviii. 66; and Paisius' *History*, &c. p. 162, &c.

[21] διοικήσεως, *i.e.* of the general government and administration of the Church. In the Slavonic it is 'sed illam solam partem *suæ potestatis* administrat sacer-

ness of the patriarch' (*παρὰ τῆς πατριαρχικῆς θείας μεγαλειότητος*). And, after a little: 'Some one might ask: Wherefore is the Pope of Rome called "the œcumenical Pope" before he was split off, and in like manner the archbishop of C.P. is called "the œcumenical patriarch," while the other patriarchs who are of the same order, vocation, and honour, have not obtained this title so as to be styled "œcumenical patriarch"? But since the Pope was by the demon of self-love ['pride' in the Slav.] separated from the company of the rest of the patriarchs, and confined to the narrowed region of the West, I do not see the patriarch of Constantinople adorned with any of the privileges of the Pope. For neither is he crowned with the *λῶρον* [*i. e.* the fillet or tiara: the same word is retained in the Slav.] of the empire, nor does he parade himself (*θεατρίζεται*) with scarlet slippers, according to the form ['ordered by Constantine the great,' Slav.], nor does he use any other privilege of the elder Rome. And on this account his feet stand straight, and his head is made hoary, according to David, with all manner of wisdom, and he does not magnify his own subscriptions as "œcumenical father," though he is so styled and glorified by us.' And, after a little more: 'But if they[22] are of the divine list of the bishops, alas! how can any one express or describe the condemnation which these draw upon themselves? For of what pardon will that teacher be counted worthy, who puts forward the canons,[23] but sees not the sublimity of the canons? Certainly, of none: but he will rather hear from God: "Thou hast rejected justice, and I will reject thee from being priest before me."' Hence therefore it is collected, and from many other testimonies also, that those of the bishops who seek or desire to take to themselves in writing unusual titles, and to proclaim themselves Effendis [*αὐθέντας*· 'hossoudari' in the Slav.], as gaping after the secular glory, and inflated by arrogance, appropriating to themselves privileges not awarded them by

dotaliter quam commissam sibi habet a patriarchali divina magnitudine,' &c. This is certainly quite wrong: and perhaps, since the argument here is against any assumption by inferior bishops, the true sense of *διοικήσεως* may be territorial: 'he acts sacerdotally in or over, or for, that *part* only of the patriarchal diocese and ministry,' &c.

[22] Instead of the word 'they' the Slav. inserts 'the Popes.'

[23] *κανόνα*, 'a canon:' but the Slav. 'who teaches and professes observance of the canons, but sees not their sublimity.'

the sacred synods, *or by emperors*, are to be *summarily punished*, and incur the *loss of their episcopal dignity*, as not being imitators of our meek Saviour Christ, but *seeking to be famed and talked of*,[24] being inflated with satanical arrogance, imitating the pride of Satan, who *promised to give to the Saviour the kingdoms of the world*, when they ought to style themselves '*servants*' (δούλους) and '*humble*.' Wherefore they shall hear from the Saviour: 'Get thee behind me, Satan!' and from the mouth of God: 'Thou hast rejected justice, which forbids to seek what does not belong to thee, and I will reject thee from being priest before me.' And what should this rejection be? What else but that *such vain boasters* are *to be put out from the episcopal chair by deposition?*

CHAP. XI.—*Question.* Can a metropolitan or a patriarch style himself in writing, and cause himself to be styled in common parlance, ruler (ἀρχηγὸς) of any other eparchy which is not subject to his own chair?[25]

Answer. The divine canons are all absolutely opposed to the bishop who presumes to attempt these enormities, both those of the holy Apostles and those of the divine fathers. So canon xxxv. of the Apostles says: 'A bishop is not to ordain out of his own bounds, nor any one from another diocese (ὑπερόρια μὴ χειροτονείτω), without the will of those of the region:'[26] and if any one is convicted of having done so, let him be deposed, together with him that has been ordained. But of the assumption of any improper title, there has been enough said above. It results therefore hence that the bishop who presumes [Slav. 'to do such things, and'] to ordain out of the bounds of his own eparchy, is to be deposed together with the person ordained, and to lose

[24] ἐπιφημίζεσθαι ἐθέλοντας· but the Slav. renders it 'wishing to be styled Hossoudar;' and for τὰς βασιλείας, 'the kingdoms,' it has 'the empire or kingdom (*tsarstvo*) of the world.'

[25] This seems directed against Nicon's style of Patriarch of Great, *Little*, and White Russia, given him by *order of the tsar* in the πολυχρόνια, and in other forms, but not of Nicon's own will, nor acted on by him so far as Little Russia is concerned. See the *Replies*, &c. p. 158-160, 501; and at p. 670, the references concerning Paisius Ligarides; also see the *Travels of Macarius*, &c. p. 281, and Paisius' *History*, p. 158.

[26] *i.e.* of the local bishops. In the Slav. 'without the consent of the rest of the eparchy,' *i.e.* of the suffragans of his province, as if the bishop meant must be a metropolitan or a patriarch, and the ordination that of a bishop.

the chair of his eparchy, as being a contemner of the constitutions of the fathers. For it is said, 'Thou shalt not move the everlasting landmarks' [in the Slav. 'Thou shalt not overstep the ancient boundaries'].

CHAP. XII.—*Question.* Can a bishop expend the revenues of the Church where he pleases, and found with them monasteries, or colonise lands?

Answer. Canon xxxviii. of the Apostles, and canon xxv. of the synod of Antioch, say: 'Let the bishop administer with authority the property of the church, appropriating from it nothing to himself, nor wasting anything' [*καταχρώμενος*: the Slavonic has '*upotreblaioushchi*,' 'consuming,' or simply 'using,' *i.e.* for his own purposes], nor giving any thing to his relations, unless they be among the poor. But if any one transgresses this canon, let him be punished by the Church.' And canon xl. of the Apostles, and canon xxiv. of the synod of Antioch, say: 'Let the property of the bishop and the property of the church be clearly distinguished, that so both the bishop may be able to dispose of his own, and the church may lose nothing.'

Gloss. 'The intent of the canon is, that whatever property the bishop brings with him when he comes to the see is to be his own; but that he is not to expend the revenues of the see on his own needs and pleasures, but keep them for the poor. Hence it is collected that the local bishop has no liberty either to found monasteries or to colonise lands not depending on the church, but belonging to himself.[27] Whence canon vii. of the First and Second council enacts that it is not lawful for any one of the bishops to found a monastery of his own, or to make any change, to the detriment of his own see.[28] And if any one be convicted

[27] *ἢ μοναστήρια κτίζειν ἢ χώρας κατοικίζειν ἑαυτῷ, μὴ ὑποτεταγμένας τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, ἀλλ' ἀποφερομένας αὐτῷ.* For this the Slav. has 'vel monasteria construere, vel oppida colonis instruere, præsertim si ecclesiæ suæ non sint subdita' (so that by putting 'oppida' of the same gender with '*monasteria*' instead of '*terras*,' and inserting 'præsertim si,' the last clause is made to refer to the monasteries as well as lands), 'sed suæ voluntati subjiceant.'

[28] *μοναστήριον ἴδιον κτίζειν ἢ νεουργεῖν ἐπὶ καταλύσει τῆς ἰδίας ἐπισκοπῆς.* The Slav. has 'monasterium suum fundare vel renovare *or* innovare,' as if the Greek had been *ἀνακαινίζειν*, and this would no doubt be covered by the more general word *νεουργεῖν*, 'res novas moliri:' but what was wanted was a direct allusion to all the lesser houses and properties transferred to be dependencies on the Iverskoy, the Krestnoy, and the Voskresensky monasteries of Nicon's foundation.

of presuming to do this, he is to incur the proper penalty; and the new property or dependency created by him [τὸ νεουργηθὲν ὑπ' αὐτοῦ· the Slav. has 'the building or work newly made by him'] is to be attached and secured to the see, so as to be its own direct property, as if there had never been any monastery there at all' [the Slav. has 'in the same way as if of old it or they had not existed']. And a little farther on: 'And if it be within the bounds of the see, there is no room for any question; but if beyond them, the monastery, with all belonging to it that is in it, shall be subject to that see in which it is situate; but the local bishop shall have only the usual rights of the bishop over it; that is, unless the see suffered any loss' [through its foundation or transformation, for which in that case, it is implied, the see is entitled to restitution].

CHAP. XIII.—*Question.* Can a bishop or a patriarch without danger [of punishment] become a curator of public (*i.e.* of civil) offices, so as to direct political affairs?

Answer. From Balsamon, patriarch of Antioch: 'The DCXXX. holy fathers of the Fourth council, viz. that of Chalcedon, in their canon vii. inserted on this subject word for word what follows: "We ordain that they who have once been made clerks are neither to go into military service nor into secular dignities (ἀξίας); and whoever presume to do this, and do not desist, are to be anathematised." And canon xxiii. of the holy Apostles runs thus: "A bishop or priest or deacon who occupies himself with military affairs (στρατείᾳ σχολάζων), and seeks to exercise both at once, secular authority and the sacerdotal ministry, is to be deposed: for the things of Cæsar [are proper to] Cæsar, and the things of God are proper (ἁρμόττει) to God." And canon vi. of the Apostles says that "A bishop or priest is not to take upon himself secular cares; if he does, he is to be deposed." For it [*i.e.* the canon] desires these to keep themselves out of the way of clamours and confusion, and without distractions to take their part in the divine ministrations. And canon lxxxi. says: "If they will not obey, so as to desist from secular cares, in that case they are also to be deposed." And canon lxxxiii. subjects the bishop who occupies himself with military matters and political administrations to deposition: "For no man," it says, "can serve two masters." And the canon of the council called the

First and Second says: "If he undertakes secular governments and cares [*ἀρχὰς καὶ φροντίδας*· the Slav. has 'if he executes secular dignities, and occupies himself with them'], he is to be expelled from his clerical rank." And canon xvi. of the synod of Carthage enacts the same: "For no man who serves as a soldier entangles himself in the business of this life, but keeps himself free that he may please him who has enlisted him, *i.e.* God." Hence, then, it results that the bishop who seeks to *thrust himself into* political commands [the Slav. has 'to take the lead in secular affairs, and to magnify himself by directing them'] and to magnify himself with secular powers, *is to be deposed from the episcopate*, as a contemner of the ecclesiastical *lordship* [*ὡς καταφρονητὴν τῆς ἐκκλησιαστικῆς ἐξουσίας*· the Slav. has 'as being careless about the greatness of the church, or about the ecclesiastical *greatness*'].

CHAP. XIV.—*Question.* Can a bishop who has put himself down to the place of the penitents claim to exercise the episcopal dignity? [can he after this again at pleasure resume the episcopal rank?]

Answer. Canon xii. of the synod held in St. Sophia says expressly: 'Let not a bishop put himself down to the place of the penitents: but if one *has* put himself down, let him no more lay claim to the episcopal honour. Hence [the Slav. inserts '*certainly*'] it is collected that a bishop who has gone away (*ἀποδημήσαντα*), after he has abandoned his see (*ἐπαρχίαν*) in order to be at rest and to live in penitence, can no more return to his see, and seek episcopal honour, and lick what he has vomited up, *as from a change of mind*' [*καὶ λήχειν ὅπερ ἐξέμεσεν, ὡς ἀπὸ παλιμβουλίας*· the Slav. has 'can *by no means* any more *lay claim to that his former chair, nor* return to his eparchy, and seek to have *his* episcopal dignity; *for this* would be *after the likeness of* him, or the dog, that licks what he *once* vomited out *of his own will*'].

CHAP. XV.—*Question.* If a bishop or patriarch, having rejected his chair without any compulsion, and having put off publicly the sacerdotal attire, saying that he will not any longer be bishop or patriarch, and having withdrawn from his chair without the cognisance [Slav. '*any* cognisance'] of the local holder of the civil authority (*τοῦ κατὰ τόπον προϊσταμένου ἡγε-*

μονικῶς) shall have gone away in order to be at rest (*ἐπὶ τῷ ἡσυχάζειν*), confessing himself [Slav. 'making himself'] unworthy to act as bishop, can he after that return to that which he has despised, and from which he has withdrawn?' [Slav. 'be restored to the place of which he has made little account,' &c.]

Answer. It has been said above that the bishop who has once been put down to the place of the penitents by himself, without any violence or compulsion of civil rulers [*ἄνευ τινὸς βίας ἢ δυναστείας αὐθεντικῆς*· Slav. 'non autem necessitate, neque oppugnatione alicujus majestatis'], has no recall open to him for the future, so as to lay claim to episcopal honour [*οὐδεμίαν ἀνάκλησιν ἔχειν τοῦ λοιποῦ ἀντιποιῆσθαι κ.τ.λ.* Slav. 'nullam omnino in futurum invitationem (*i.e.* nullum invitationis locum) habet honorem iterum episcopalem recuperandi']. For no one, say the divine oracles, *putteth his hand to the plough* and again taketh it off. For *the plough is penitence*,[29] through which we reap the fruits of salvation. And to have also put off the sacerdotal attire *before many*, and at the putting-off of each of the sacred vestments to have said, 'I am unworthy of this,' left him[30] no longer room for any pretext to put on again that attire which he had [the Slav. inserts 'voluntarily'] put off in such a way. For as in gradually proceeding through the degrees of the priesthood he was vested one by one with the sacred vestments up to the omophorion (the pallium), by which he became a bishop, and attained that grade, so, putting off these same, beginning from this, viz. the omophorion, and going backwards, he remained at last, as he was originally, a private person and a monk [Slav. 'a simple monk'], having himself passed sentence upon himself (*αὐτὸς καθ' ἑαυτοῦ ἀποφήνας*) after the celebration of the sacred liturgy. Wherefore he is by no means to be received when he runs back, and again claims the episcopal dignity. For such awful matters must not be played with (*τὰ γὰρ φρικτὰ οὐ δικαιὸν γίνεσθαι παικτά*). This is collected also from the great *Νόμιμον* of the great church, that he who has

[29] This is what Nicon, in the council which condemned him, called 'nonsense' and 'trash.' See Paisius' *History*, &c. p. 41-46, 183.

[30] Here Nicon is directly mentioned rather than covertly alluded to. See the *Replies*, &c. (Questions iv. and v. of the xxx.), p. xxvii. 20, 21, 23, 103, 673; and Paisius' *History*, p. 41-46, 166, 179, 191.

once contemned the episcopal *ministry* is not to be received any more to the episcopal *honour* [Slav. '*labour*' and '*rank*'].

CHAP. XVI.—*Question.* But if it so happened that after this practical resignation he was invited through men of note, or even through a letter of the local ruler—it may be even by himself personally[31]—and that lifting himself up against this ruler, he should not have returned, what is to be done?

Answer. Can. xlvi. of the synod of Laodicea, and can. liii. of that of Carthage, say: 'A bishop who is called to a synod and disregards the call, except it be for some extraordinary hindrance (*εἰ μὴ ἀναμαλίαν*), is to be punished. But if, farther, confiding in the multitude of his own people, he despises brotherly charity, let him be punished by the secular power' (*ἀρχοντικῶς παιδευέσθω*). Hence, then, it is collected that there is no recall for such an accumulator of contumacy [*οὐδεμίαν ἀνάκλησιν ἔχειν τὸν τοιοῦτον ἀλλοπρόσαλλον ὑπερόπτην*· Slav. 'quod nullius *ultra* revocationis (locum or spem) habeat talis turbulentus malefactor']; *first*, because he has despised the christian congregation committed to him; *secondly*, because he has been contemptuous towards the chair; *thirdly*, because he went off to penitence, and confessed himself unworthy of the episcopal ministry, without [Slav. inserts '*any sort of*'] compulsion; *fourthly*, because he hardens himself in disobedience [Slav. 'impenitence and disobedience'] and persists in obstinacy, and has refused to yield to the entreaties of them that invited him back, it may be even of the sovereign.[32] Wherefore not only is he not to be received back to the episcopal ministry, but

[31] The Slav. *omits* the remarkable words '*it may be by himself personally*,' and translates thus: 'Si acciderit post veram illam rejectionem per aliquos honorabiles viros, vel per scripturam summi rectoris ejus loci, vocare (where we must either understand eumdem rectorem for the agent and illum for the object, or suppose 'vocare' to be a blunder for vocari, *προσκληθῆναι*), ille autem velut augens se in pinguitudinem, nihil curans de his, non voluerit redire, quid est faciendum?' The Greek is, *εἰ δὲ συνέβη μετὰ τὴν ἔμπρακτον ταύτην παραίτησιν, προσκληθῆναι δι' ἀξιολόγων ἀνδρῶν, ἢ καὶ δι' ἐπιστολῆς τοῦ κατὰ τόπον ἡγεμονεύοντος, τυχὸν καὶ παρουσίας, κατεπαιρόμενος τούτῳ οὐκ ἐπανέλθῃ, τί δεῖ ποιεῖν;*

[32] *Τυχὸν καὶ τοῦ ἡγεμονεύοντος*· the Slav. 'quarto quod in impœnitentiâ et inobedientiâ sit, et in ferocitate sententiæ suæ jactet se, et nolit rogationi revocantium satisfacere, neque vel ejus ipsius qui summo imperio fungitur.'

he is also to be *punished by the civil ruler* according to the canon, as a private person.[33]

CHAP. XVII.—*Question.*[34] But suppose that, after such a practical resignation, such a one shall unblushingly presume, in the place to which he went to be at rest (ἡσυχάσαι, to be in retirement), to do the acts belonging to the episcopate, or to hold ordinations? what is to be done?

Answer. Let him be *excommunicated*, and *punished by the civil power* (ἀρχοντικῶς παιδευέσθω), according to the canon set forth above, together with him that has been ordained. For if he who ordains out of his own bounds is deposed, together with the person ordained, how much more he who, after making such a resignation both of the sacred vestments and of the ministry, has dared to stretch forth his hand to impart the Holy Ghost, whose ministry he has renounced of his own will and has gone off as a deserter into private life' [Slav. 'et in simplicem vitam monasticam descendit'].

CHAP. XVIII.—*Question.* Is it lawful for any bishop who pleases to leave his own eparchy, and go whithersoever he lists, without danger [of punishment]?

Answer. From § i. of the great Νόμιον on can. cvi. of the synod of Carthage: 'Let not bishops absent themselves, except with the consent of the first see of the country to which the bishop seeking to absent himself belongs: that is, not unless he has first obtained from the primate himself that *more particular* form of letter (κατεξαίρετον) which is called *dimissory*,' &c. By the words 'more particular' is to be understood either from the greater ecclesiastical primate (παρὰ τοῦ ἐκκλησιαστικῶς προϊσταμένου μείζονος, ab illo qui principaliter primatum gerit), if perchance there be [such a double subordination], or from him who is first or preëminent *politically*.[35] The gloss of Zonaras: 'The

[33] ὡς ἰδιώτην' Slav. 'as *a simple monk*.'

[34] See *Replies of Nicon* (question iv. of the xxx.), p. xxvii. 597-601.

[35] ἢ παρὰ τοῦ πολιτικῶς. Nicon might have called this too nonsense and trash, if he heard it read. The Greek is, εἰ μὴ μετὰ ψηφίσματος τῆς πρώτης καθέδρας τοῦ ἰδίου ἑκάστης χώρας ἐπισκόπου· τουτέστιν, εἰ μὴ ἀπ' αὐτοῦ τοῦ πρωτεύοντος (necessarily by its connection with καθέδρας above a *bishop*) κατεξαίρετον λάβῃ τὴν ἥτις λέγεται ἀπολυτικὴ, κ.τ.λ. Τὸ κατεξαίρετον ἐννοεῖται ἢ παρὰ τοῦ ἐκκλησιαστικῶς προϊσταμένου μείζονος, εἰ τυχὸν εἴη, ἢ παρὰ τοῦ πολιτικῶς. The Slav. repeats

bishops and the rulers (*προεστῶτες*) of the rational flock of Christ are all absolutely required both by justice itself and by the canons, which follow [and enforce] justice, to abide in their churches, and to feed and govern the people committed to them.' And a little farther on: 'But if there be need to go away, it must be with the consent of the first *chair*, either the ecclesiastical *or that of the civil ruler*' (*μετὰ ψηφίσματος τῆς πρώτης καθέδρας, ἢ τῆς ἐκκλησιαστικῆς ἢ τῆς αὐξεντικῆς*. And so in the Slav. 'abeat cum permissione primi *throni* sive spiritualis, *sive etiam sæcularis*'). Balsamon's gloss on the same says that 'there is necessary for this the judgment even of all the synod of their region (*τῆς κατ' αὐτῶν συνόδου*), according to can. xi. of the synod of Antioch. For on this account there is added to the canon the proviso that there is required the consent of the others also, but preëminently (*κατεξαίρετον*) that of him who is first [or primate], the patriarch, it may be, or the civil ruler' [*αὐξέντου*. The Slav. has: 'there is required the consent thereto *of the highest in authority*, or the counsel of all the synod, according to, &c. but preëminently that of him who holds the primacy (primatum gerit), whether patriarch or prince,' kniaz]. And can. lxxiii. of the synod of Carthage says: 'Again it pleased the synod that it shall not be lawful for any bishop leaving his *proper* (*αὐξεντικῆς αὐτοῦ καθέδρας*) chair to take himself away to some church *in the diocese*,[36] or busying himself beyond what is reasonable for a long time about some matter of his own, to neglect the care and the continuity [continuous occupancy] of his proper chair.' The gloss of Zonaras: 'The bishops are required both by justice itself, and by the exactness of the divine canons, to abide in their own episcopates, and to teach the people and govern them; and *not* [Slav. 'by no manner of

---

faithfully this monstrous gloss, worthy of Paisius Ligarides' own inspiration: 'Sine permissione primæ *sedis*, sui episcopi in eâ regione existentis, id est, præter omnem qualemcumque voluntatem vel scripturam specialiter primam potestatem habentis, [non sine] illâ epistolâ quæ vocatur dimissoriâ, &c. Hæc vox *specialiter* intelligitur aut de eo qui est ecclesiæ maxime principalis, si fuerit aliquis ejusmodi, *aut* de eo *qui in sæculo* ejusmodi,' or '*talis esse* intelligitur.'

[36] But the Slav. has 'within *his own eparchy*,' which is not the sense of the Greek word diocese, nor the sense of the synod of Carthage, nor that of Balsamon, as quoted below, but which is meant to apply to Nicon's residence at Voskresensk *within his own eparchy*. And what follows is without sense: 'Vel in suâ aliquâ necessitate, vel in breve tempus ibi maneat, hoc est, quod curam parvam et expletionem de suâ cathedrâ habeat.'

means'] to leave their own proper (*αὐθεντικὰς*) chairs, that is, I suppose, their original (*πρωτοτύπους*) thrones.[37] And can. xvi. of the synod held in the church of the holy Apostles, called the First and Second, says: 'The divine fathers (the fathers, that is, of that synod) decreed that a bishop is not to be absent more than six months from his proper episcopate; and the penalty for him who does not observe this canon is *deposition*.' But can. xi. of the synod of Sardica, from the example which it introduces, seems to contract within a less space of time the allowable absence of the bishop, unless any necessity be upon him. And can. i. of the synod of Carthage says: 'If any bishop neglect his own flock, and, not being hindered by any illness, or kept by imperial or patriarchal command, remain absent beyond the space of six months, let him be altogether deprived of the honour of a bishop.' And can. xii. of the synod of Sardica: 'He that goes away to possessions out of his bounds is not to tarry longer than three weeks.' With these canons St. Cyril also agrees in ch. iii. of his epistle to Domnus: 'For that they who serve in the priesthood,' he says, 'should resign their churches agrees not with the laws of the Church. For if they are worthy to minister, they ought not to resign; but if they are unworthy, let them not go out by resigning, but upon conviction of crimes laid to their charge. But if any one should have resigned his see, and left the flock committed to him, for him to claim the ministry[38] (*λειτουργίας*) again after this would not be just. For it is plain that he resigns the labour and difficulty of governing, and the task of doing his best to check the tendency of this world to go on from bad to worse, and that he would retain and appropriate all that brings honour and respect, inclining more to slothfulness than to the diligent care of souls.' And from can. xvi. of the synod called the First and Second it is shown that they are mad who opine thus, viz. that the bishops can resign

[37] The Slav. has for *αὐθεντικὰς* a word nachalniðshie, 'principalissimos,' intended to apply to a bishop's chair in his chief sobor or cathedral, *e.g.* in the cathedral of the Assumption at Moscow, as distinguished from those chairs which he has in every other sobor and church of his eparchy. For in the Eastern churches there is such a chair, on which no one sits but the diocesan, in every church. And then the Slav. or Latin garbler goes on boldly, and for 'that is, I suppose, their *original* thrones (*πρωτοτύπους*)' substitutes, without 'I suppose,' 'that is, his cathedral church' (sobornouyon svoiou tserkov).

[38] But the Slav. has 'for him afterwards *to celebrate the liturgy* is not allowable,' which is quite another thing.

their episcopates, but still retain the priesthood. For this canon decrees that 'he who for any longer time than six months absents himself from his proper episcopate, not being prevented from returning by any necessary impediment, is to lose *both the episcopate and the priesthood*.' But if he who commits the less offence is thus condemned, how much more shall not he who has at once and altogether resigned the episcopate, and despised the care of the flock for all his life, be punished for having, so far as he was concerned, abandoned to the wolves the holy flock intrusted to him by Christ the chief shepherd? to say nothing of his being allowed to take as a prize to himself the privileges of the priesthood. Of this can. x. of St. Dionysius also treats: 'If, then, they who are called to preside over the people, if they do not obey at the first, are by the canons sentenced to excommunication, who that has any reason can accept, without making any difficulty of it, the resignation of those that are already established as pastors, and not rather punish such *with the utmost severity possible*?' Besides, the name of the episcopate is expressive of act and energy.[39] And he who has cast off voluntarily the *energy* has lost also the church. And not being fit to be called a bishop, how shall he lay claim to the priesthood? Or how shall he be called a *hierarch* who has no clergy under him, nor is an *archon* (ruler) of any *hieroménon* (priests)? And if the name of hierarchy does not belong to him, much less certainly can the energy [the active exercise] of *this* [*i.e.* of the *ἱεραρχία* or episcopate. But the Slav. goes farther, and says, 'on this account much less can he be competent to exercise the *priesthood*,' opus sacerdotii]. Moreover, in the missive of the Third holy œcumenical council, concerning a certain Eustathius, it is shown to those who rightly consider the matter that such as resign their churches forfeit at once both the episcopate [meaning the see], and the priesthood [meaning the honour of a bishop: but the Slav. translator, and perhaps the compilers of the Greek, here mean it otherwise]. For this Eustathius being a bishop of Pamphylia, and having fallen into difficulties, resigned the episcopate. And to that place another had already been appointed. But he betook himself weeping to the holy synod, not contesting the see with him who held it, but seeking only the name and honour of

[39] Compare the words of Paisius Ligarides in the *Replies of Nicon* (question xix. of the xxx.), p. xxix. 107, 109; and Paisius' *History*, p. 61, 62, 175.

a bishop. And the fathers, feeling both for the tears and for the advanced old age of Eustathius, and fearing lest anything should happen to him from his excessive grief, allowed him to retain the name of the episcopate, and the honour, and the communion of a bishop, so as to enter within the altar, and to communicate there. But he was *neither* [Slav. '*by no means* either'] to celebrate himself, nor to ordain. But this was done by the holy fathers not canonically, but of economy and unusual condescension, as he who reads the epistle through with attention will see. Hence, therefore, it is collected that he who has resigned his eparchy is deprived also of the honour and of the exercise of the ministry of a bishop, according to the canons.[40]

CHAP. XIX.—*Question.*[41] But if any metropolitan or patriarch, having left his original[42] (or cathedral) chair, shall not have gone beyond the bounds of his eparchy, but should be found remaining in some place or monastery within the bounds of his eparchy above the space of six months, will *he* then incur this penalty?

Answer. This is *even more enormous* (ἀτοπώτερον) than if he had gone out of the bounds of his eparchy. For if he abandons his chair, and takes not the proper care of its government, but behaves himself contemptuously as if he were its enemy, and a hireling not a shepherd, and when informed against, it may be, or even requested to return, refuses to return to his chair, such a one is stripped of the episcopal honour even more than he who remains absent beyond the bounds of his eparchy, as being wounded by harshness and passion (*ὡς σκληρότητι καὶ ἐμπαθείᾳ τετρωσκόμενος*· Slav. 'by the arrow of stiffneckedness and inward passion'), and harbouring anger against his own flock, for which he ought to have been ready to expose himself to danger, and lay down his life, according to the Lord's word.

[40] The Slav. has 'deservedly and canonically.'

[41] See the *Replies*, &c. (question xviii. of the xxx.), p. xxix. 96, &c.

[42] *πρωτότυπον* in the sense purposely given to this word and to *αὐθεντικὴν* above. The Slav. has here the same word, *nachalnièshi*, as that by which *αὐθεντικὴν* was rendered above, 'principalissimam cathedram;' *πρωτότυπον*, when added by Zonaras as a gloss, being then rendered by 'svoiou sobornuyou tserkov,' his cathedral.

CHAP. XX.—*Question.*[43] Is it lawful, then, for the local synod to elect (χειροτονῆσαι) another bishop in this eparchy, instead of the one who is thus obnoxious to the canons (τοῦ ὑπευθύνου· the Slav. has 'qui inventus est in culpa') ?

Answer. By all means. For the Church of Christ ought not to be left deprived of her spiritual head, when he who was aforetime entitled her bishop has once (εἰσάπαξ) been split off (ἀπορῥαγέντος καὶ ἀποδοκιμασθέντος· Slav. 'deposito semel et absolute abdicato,' *i.e.* rejecto) and rejected. For canon xxv. of the Fourth holy council says expressly: 'Let not a church remain in widowhood longer than three months, but within this time let a bishop be appointed. If this is not done, let those who neglect to appoint one be punished' (ἐπιτιμηθήσονται). And the chosen vessel Paul cries aloud to Timothy: 'What thou hast heard from us in presence of many witnesses, the same deliver thou to faithful men, who may be able to teach others also.' But the office of teaching is not committed to others than to the bishops. Whence it results necessarily that the local synod, after making canonical election by votes [ψήφους κανονικὰς ποιησαμένην· Slav. 'datis sortibus canonicis, vel regularibus, *et vocalibus*'], is to establish a hierarch for that chair who seems to be blameless, that the flock of the Lord may not halt as one lame (μὴ χωλεύῃ). And if it delays to do so, it will subject itself to punishment, according to the canon of the Fourth council, [to be inflicted] not only by the superior synod, but also by God.

CHAP. XXI.—*Question.* If any metropolitan or patriarch being under accusation be judged by the bishops about him, when perhaps he has been some years in that eparchy, and it so be that all the bishops about him were ordained by him, can he refuse the judgment passed by them against him on the pretext that he is accounted to be their father, and they stand to him in the relation of sons?

Answer. *Relation*, according to those who are skilled in dialectics, is of many different kinds. One kind is *essential* (κατὰ τὸ εἶναι), another *nominal* (κατὰ τὸ λέγεσθαι), and it is understood according to the different relations of the subject spoken of. For example: A man in relation to his own offspring is said to

[43] See the *Replies*, &c. (question xx. xxi. of the xxx.), p. xxx. 122-135, &c.

be a parent, and has the relation of paternity. But in that he is a man (ὢν δὲ ἄνθρωπος) according to the relation of identity, and the definition of man, if he be referred to [*i.e.* compared with] his offspring, he has no difference. In just the same way, if a metropolitan, it may be, or a patriarch be compared as their elder with those, the bishops around him, whom he has ordained, in respect of ordination they would be his sons; but in respect of the identity of the episcopate and the greatness of the spiritual dignity, they would be called fellow-brethren and fellow-bishops, and ministers of the same one God. Whence also the blessed Paul in his epistles at one time calls them his *children*, as having been enlightened by him, 'my son Timothy,' and 'my son Titus,' but at another also 'brethren,' as fellow-apostles. And the Lord 'is not ashamed to call men his brethren.' And again: 'Behold I, and the children whom God hath given me.' It appears therefore hence, that according to the relation of their ordination, and according to that of their order [*i.e.* rank and precedence], this [metropolitan or patriarch] is father to the bishops about him: but in respect of the episcopate and the spiritual power they are fellow-brethren and fellow-bishops: so that he will have no ground for saying that the bishops who have been ordained by him cannot judge him, when he has incurred penalties according to the divine canons, nor give a vote which shall be lawful against him. For fatherhood and sonship have no place in respect of justice [*i.e.* when the question is one of justice and right; the Slav. has 'in a matter of judgment, in causa vel quæstione judicii'], and least of all in ecclesiastical questions, when spiritual danger is involved. For the Divine says: 'He who is on other occasions meek, when he knows that God is being wronged becomes in very truth a warrior.'[44]

Chap. XXII.—*Question.*[45] But if, rejecting their judgment, he has recourse to an appeal, what will be the consequence?

Answer. The judgment [the Slav. inserts '*already*'] pronounced in writing by the œcumenical chair [the chair of C.P.],

[44] ὄντως γίνεται μαχητής· the Slav. has 'cum videat damnum *animæ suæ* desuper impendere, tum revera verus vindex et bellator contra oppugnantem se et inferentem ejusmodi injuriam efficitur:' so that if the quotation as it stood in the Greek too plainly suited Nicon rather than his enemies, the translation at any rate is all their own.

[45] See the *Replies of Nicon*, &c. p. 309.

and by the patriarchs ranking after it, against him, according to what appears legitimate (*νόμιμον*) and canonical, as has been said above (that chair having from the canons this privilege), must be of force against him, without any other pretext (*προφάσεως*) for farther contention being left in this matter.[46]

CHAP. XXIII.—*Question.* Can such a one be deposed even by a less number than that of twelve bishops?

Answer. Matthew Blastar says: 'But if both sides choose arbitrators, even though they be fewer than the number required in other canons, viz. than twelve bishops, he that is condemned by them cannot appeal.'

CHAP. XXIV.—*Question.* Can a bishop or a patriarch make innovations, and introduce into his own church unusual services (or ritual observances), and re-model the established (*διατεταγμένας*) holy liturgies?

Answer. Something has been said of this already above; and now we say farther that every innovation which is put forward by only a particular authority (*μερικῶς προβαλλομένη*) is an occasion for confusion and disorder. For those which are recognised by the holy synods are not called innovations, but ordinances (*διατάξεις*) for the compaction of the Christian people. But he who of particular authority (*μερικῶς*) presumes to do such things, especially if he corrupts what has been put forth by holy men, and recognised by the holy fathers, and confirmed by length of time, foisting in strange things of his own, is to be cast out [Slav. adds '*and deposed*'] as a worker of confusion, and is to be anathematised (Slav. to be excommunicated, or rather delivered to an anathema) together with his innovations. For the divine Paul says: 'If any man shall preach to you aught beside that which we have preached to you, though it be an angel from heaven, let him be anathema.' And the Saviour

[46] The *intention* seems to be certainly that this document, in case of need, may be used as a final decision made by anticipation; and this sense is unequivocally fixed upon it in the Slav. translation by the insertion of the word '*already*' (*uje*); and thus it was practically used by the two patriarchs and the synod which condemned Nicon in 1666. But the answer as it stands in the Greek leaves it open to suppose that in case of such an appeal the patriarchs, before declaring by a written and irreversible judgment the guilt of Nicon, must try him personally, and hear freely all that he may have to say for himself.

gives sentence (*ἀποφαίνεται*) that he who causes scandal is to have a millstone tied about his neck, and to be cast into the sea. Wherefore they that wish to be religious must keep all that has been put forth by the synods and by the saints unimpugned [*ἀπαραβάλευτα*· the Slav. has 'intemerata et immutata'].

CHAP. XXV.—*Question.* If any one strike a servant of a bishop, or metropolitan, or patriarch, does the insult [*ὕβρις*, Slav. 'injuria'] pass (*ἀναφέρεται*) to his lord? [the Slav. inserts 'or not'] and can he of himself alone judge the insult or wrong, or not rather the civil tribunal?

Answer. Not every insult (or wrong) passes to the lord, but only that which is expressly inflicted on the lord's account. But if the servant is doing anything disorderly, and is insulted or beaten to bring him to order [*ὑβριζομένου ἢ τυπτομένου ἐπὶ σωφρονισμῷ*· the Sl. has 'is beaten *and barked at with dishonouring words by the chief nobles of the tsar*, a viris principalissimis'] by those who are set over the execution of the emperor's commands, that insult remains upon him only who is disorderly, and does not pass to his lord. But if the lord is displeased, the judgment of such a case does not belong to him, but it shall be carried before the civil (*πολιτικὸν κριτήριον*) tribunal; and it is thence that the sentence shall be pronounced. But if he passes judgment for himself against the man who struck his servant (*αὐτὸς πρὸς αὑτοῦ δίκην κατὰ τοῦ τυπτήσαντος ἐξενέγκει*), then, as a contemner *of the superior tribunal*, and as trying by disorder to correct disorder, he shall incur punishment, and shall be without excuse (*ὑπεύθυνος ἔσται καὶ ἀναπολόγητος*). For no man rights himself[47] as prosecutor and judge at once, but the judgment must be referred to others, as the laws prescribe.

Epilogue.

So there is put forth a common synodical sentence (*ψῆφος*) that the bishop to whom these Questions apply [*τὸν ὑπεύθυνον ὄντα*· Slav. 'episcopus is qui inventus sit in talibus quæstionibus culpabilis'] is, according to these Answers, to receive punishment without any fear of wrong being done thereby;[48] and is to be

[47] *i. e.* can rightly do so. That he sometimes *does* in fact right himself is pretty clear from what is going on now. Οὐδεὶς γὰρ ἑαυτὸν ἐκδικεῖ ὡς ἐνάγων καὶ κριτής.

[48] That is, if only he *be really guilty, on which nothing either is said or can*

cast out from the episcopal honour and dignity; and another in lieu of him is to be elected (or ordained or instituted, *κεχειροτονῆσθαι*· Slav. 'constituendum esse') to this eparchy lawfully and canonically, and as a matter of course.[49] For we are fellow-workers with God, as following the footsteps of the apostles: and we ought not to allow the vineyard of God to be spoiled by deceitful foxes (*ὑποὺλοις*), nor his flock to be scattered by bloodthirsty wolves. If we do otherwise, we shall have to give account to him in the day of judgment as having neglected the souls which he redeemed with his own blood, and the flocks (*ποιμνίων*) which he drew together from the ends of the world by the net of the apostles. Praying the three-sunned light of the Godhead, which is over all, to strengthen (*στηρίζειν*) his Church against all her visible and invisible enemies, ✠ I Dionysius, by the mercy of God archbishop of C.P. New Rome, and œcumenical patriarch, confirm and ratify all the above as canonical. ✠ I Paisius, by the mercy of God pope and patriarch of the great city of Alexandria, and œcumenical judge, confirm the above as agreeing with the ecclesiastical canons. ✠ I Macarius, by the mercy of God patriarch of the great city of God Antioch and of all the East, in confirmation have subscribed [subscribed by himself in Arabic, with the Greek in small character added by another hand]. ✠ I Nectarius, by the mercy of God patriarch of the holy city of Jerusalem and of all Palestine, confirm the above as agreeing with the ecclesiastical canons.

[The Slav. translation of the Epilogue, instead of making the last few words of it an introduction to the signatures, as they must be, ends thus: 'de ovibus (*ποιμνίων*) quæ sunt ab extremitatibus terræ reti apostolico collectæ et coadunatæ, precantes una et rogantes trifulgidam lucem sanctissimæ Deitatis ut confirmet suam ecclesiam et liberet ab omnibus visibilibus et invisibilibus hostibus. Amen.' And then follow fac-similes of the signatures, and after them the translations of them in Russian type.]

be said in such a document: *κατὰ τὰς ἀποκρίσεις ἀπροκριματίστως τῆς παιδείας ἀπολαβεῖν*· the Slav. has 'secundum responsiones factas (vel ordinatas) sine ullo peccato obtinebit debitum sibi supplicium,' &c.

[49] *νομίμως καὶ κανονικῶς καὶ γνησίως*· Slav. 'secundum legem et secundum canones *veriissimus*,' as if it had been *γνήσιος*, referring to the new pastor to be elected; but then it should be *γνήσιον*· and neither so could it stand. It means 'regularly, properly,' as opposed to *νοθευτικῶς, κιβδηλῶς*.

[Annexed is the following] 'Separate statement (ἔκθεσις, or codicil) of Nectarius patriarch of Jerusalem, with the subscription of his hand:'

'By the present tome is judged not only a bishop, or a metropolitan, but also a patriarch. *However*, there is *need* [the Slav. substitutes '*placet* or *conveniens est certè ut*'] that a synod should be assembled, and that he who is charged under these heads should be summoned once and again, and a third time. And if he obey the synod and appear, and make a defence, he is to be judged *according to his defence* by the synod. But if he contemn the synod, and do not appear, the synod will then condemn him, even though absent [the Slav. adds, 'and will finish the matter']. But if any one, being a patriarch, stands out, saying that he is not amenable, nor can be called in question (ὅτι οὐκ εὐθύνεται, οὔτε ἀνακρίνεται) by bishops or metropolitans, because he is above them in honour, let such a one know that even a metropolitan may judge and depose a patriarch, when he has assembled the rest of the bishops, as many as may be [able to be] present. For Acratius the metropolitan of Cæsarea deposed Macedonius the bishop of Constantinople, as Socrates relates (*Hist. Eccl.* lib. ii. cap. 23). And the Eastern bishops deposed Pope Julius, as Sozomen relates (lib. iii. cap. 2): and the martyr bishop Cyprian opposed strenuously the then Pope, who said that heretics ought not to be rebaptised. So that every person [who is a bishop] may be judged by every person [though he be only a bishop] by the present compilation (or collection, συντάγματι), made from the holy canons. Written at Jassy, A.D. 1664, in the month of February. Nectarius, patriarch of the holy city of Jerusalem.'

VI.

At p. 76-82, where Paisius Ligarides is sent with other commissioners from the tsar and the council to Voskresensk, 17th July, A.D. 1663, compare Nicon's account of the same in his *Replies*, &c. p. 586-604.

VII.

Separate Letter of Nectarius patriarch of Jerusalem to the tsar Alexis Michaelovich, requesting him to restore Nicon to the patriarchal chair of Moscow, written in A.D. 1664, *March* 20, and sent

from Jassy together with the patriarchal tomes containing the xxv. Questions and Answers, with the codicil appended by Nectarius, as given above. Printed in Greek and Slavonic, in Roumantseff's *Collection*, &c. vol. iv. p. 134-143.

In God our Saviour, who is hymned in a trinity of persons and worshipped in a unity of godhead, the Father unbegotten, but begetter of a Son,[50] and *only* producer of the Holy Ghost, the Son beloved, and the Holy Ghost eternally proceeding from the Father *only*, and through the Son both manifested and distributed to the creatures, one essence, one kingdom, one power, which created the world visible and invisible, and provides for and rules the universe—to thee the most faithful in Christ and most orthodox, divinely-crowned, divinely-guarded, invincible and holy emperor (*βασιλεῖ*), and spiritually our most beloved son, Kyr Kyr [Slav. Hossoudar] Alexis Michaelovich, autocrat of all Great and Little and White Russia, emperor (*βασιλεῖ*, Slav. tsar) of Moscow, Kieff, Vladimir, and Novgorod, emperor of Kazan, emperor of Astrachan, emperor of Siberia, lord (*αὐθέντῃ*, Slav. hossoudar) of Pskoff, and grand prince (*μεγάλῳ κνέζῃ*) of Lithuania, Smolensk, Tver, Volhynia, Podolia, Yougorsk, Perm, Viatka, Bulgaria, and other countries, lord and grand prince (*αὐξέντῃ καὶ μεγάλῳ κνέζῃ*, hossoudar i veliki kniaz) of Nijny Novgorod, of Chernigoff, of Riazan, of Polotsk, of Rostoff, of Yaroslaff, of Bielozersk, of Oudorsk, of Obdorsk, of Kondisk, of Vitebsk, of Mstislaff, and of all the northern regions, ruler [*νικητῇ*, 'conqueror,' in the Greek, but ruler or commander only in the Slav.] and lord [*αὐξέντῃ*, hossoudar] of the countries of Iberia, Kartalenia, Georgia, and Imeretia, of the Circassian and Gorski princes, and of many other provinces and principalities in the East and West and North hereditary lord and ruler; grace, peace, power, and victory, and abiding continuance of the most exalted throne of thy holy empire for a long succession of thy sacred family, most religious and most faithful in Christ—this is what our mediocrity prays for from Him the almighty and all-ruling God, the King of

[50] The Slav. translation after 'begetter of a Son' *omits καὶ προβολῇ μόνῃ* [*προβολεῖ μόνῳ*] *τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος*, and inserts instead 'who was made man by the sole overshadowing of the Holy Ghost,' and then continues with the Greek, 'the Son beloved,' &c. In this we may trace beyond a doubt the hand of Paisius Ligarides, who expressly claims the Slavonic translation as his own, because it was made from his *Latin*.

kings and Lord of lords, by whom, as He himself says, kings reign and lords have lordship.

The most august and holy letter of thy sacred and holy hand we received from the hierodiacon Meletius with all due respect and honour, as also *the alms which accompanied it*, which you sent in honour of the holy and life-giving sepulchre of our Lord. In this letter we *did not find* either the *cause* for the withdrawal of your patriarch Kyr Nicon, the beloved brother and fellow-minister of our humility, *nor any other charge whatever against him* than that of his five years' absence. But from the deacon Meletius we heard very many things as if from the lips of your holy majesty, as he said: and he showed me also *a certain short writing*, as a memorandum given him, *adjuring him by God to tell us all that he knows about Kyr Nicon and his adversaries*. And as regards his adversaries, he said that they had offended against Kyr Nicon in certain small matters not worthy of any attention.[61] But as regards Kyr Nicon, he mentioned certain weighty matters and almost unpardonable, and all of them innovations, which to us *did not appear altogether credible*. However, on account of this affair, your imperial letter invited us to come to your holy majesty, in order to its due examination and settlement. But since it is not possible for us either to go or to send our representatives, on account of the dangers impending, and for other reasons of which you will be orally informed by the bearers of this letter, in conformity with our order, we have adopted another way of delivering a judgment hypothetically, that this matter may be set right.

To utter *a definitive judgment*, grounded upon what Meletius said, *was not reasonable;* and it would have been contrary also to the ecclesiastical canons on the testimony of only one witness, and that one too of the lowest grade [of the priesthood], to pronounce a judgment against a patriarch, when neither do the civil laws allow of this. We have written, however, a synodal tome, consisting of selections from the ecclesiastical and synodal canons and from the laws of the imperial constitutions, as compendious answers to what Meletius said. *What* he said we do

[61] περὶ μὲν τῶν ἀντιπάλων αὐτοῦ μικρά τινα ἔλεγε προσκεκρουκέναι τῷ Κὺρ Νίκωνι καὶ λόγου μηδενὸς ἀξια· but the Slav. translator has rendered it 'according to what he said, *they adduce* only a few charges, and those unworthy of attention.'

not write distinctly, but you can tell [what it was] *from the Answers* of the synodal tome: for all that is written in it consists of answers to *all that we heard from Meletius and that he said about Kyr Nicon.* Nevertheless these heads are nowhere about the dogmas of the faith, but about the ecclesiastical administration, viz. that Kyr Nicon devised certain innovations as to the ecclesiastical order, and desires to maintain these contrary to [the previous] custom. But the greatest matter of all these was his withdrawal, and that[52] in presence of the church he uttered a renunciation of the patriarchal chair *on the ground of the people not being obedient.*[53] It seems to us, however, that you may set right in a pacific manner the matter by once more, or twice if need be, recalling Kyr Nicon, and bidding him to return to his chair, showing him the heads of our tome, that he may observe them. And if he appears in time past to have contravened them, as Meletius said he did, but will now change his mind and be content to observe them, then in that case he is worthy of forgiveness. For there have been very many such cases in the Church (and where the imputations were graver than these), which have been arranged for the decency of peace. So we entreat your sacred majesty not to incline your most equitable ear to the counsels *of men who delight in mischief* (χαιρεκάκων· Slav. 'of *envious* men'), who love faction and disorder, especially if such are of the spiritual order. For God is our witness, that we have been much grieved by the scandals which have occurred in the Russian Church, so that there is much more reason for us than for Jeremiah to utter those words of his: 'My bowels, my bowels are pained; my heart is afflicted, and my soul: my heart is torn asunder.' He was lamenting for a bodily war; but I groan and weep for a spiritual; and like him I say: 'Who will give water to my head, and fountains of tears to mine eyes,' that I may weep for the discord and the division that has grown up in the Church of our Lord? For discord

[52] ἡ ἐκείνου ἀναχώρησις ἦν, καὶ ὄχι ἐπ' ἐκκλησίας ἐξεφώνησε τὴν παραίτησιν τοῦ θρόνου τοῦ πατριαρχικοῦ διὰ τὸν ἀπειθῆ λαόν; but this makes no sense, and ὄχι is either here an *interrogative*, or a mere corruption for ὅτι. The Slav. translator however has: 'the gravest matter of all this *is* his *absence*, but *not that* he before the church uttered an abdication of the patriarchal chair, on account of the disobedience of the people.' In any case ὅτι must be supplied.

[53] Either, then, Meletius had mentioned as Nicon's true reason the non-compliance of the people, including the boyars and the tsar, with his requirements, or Nectarius of himself perceived that this was the reason.

and disorder in the Church is more dreadful than any war, as it rends the seamless robe of Christ, which not even the hard-hearted soldiers were allowed to rend at the time of Christ's suffering. But to rend the robe of Christ is a manifest destruction of souls for whom Christ died. Or know ye not that the Churches which are with us under the yoke of bondage are likened by us to ships that are ready to sink under the incessant assaults of the heathen? and we were used to regard the Church of you pious Russians as being alone like a second ark of Noah, saved from all the flood of the Gentiles, and preserving within her uncorrupted the seeds of piety. But now who has bewitched you out of this blessing of peace? Wherefore do ye so cruelly reject your first inheritance? For your first inheritance was peace. For 'peace,' he said, when he was going to death, 'I leave to you; my peace I give to you.' Or know ye not that he who voluntarily rejects his first inheritance loses also his adoption as a son, and no longer has Christ for a father? for how can he who has not peace have Christ for a father? Reflecting, then, on this, O most peace-loving sovereign, emulate the meekness of David, show zeal for the orthodox faith, and exert thyself strenuously to reseat your lawful patriarch in his proper chair, that there be not set up in the time of thy holy reign such an evil and ruinous precedent for changing your patriarchs, when they are orthodox and rightminded in the doctrines of the faith. For this is the source of the ruin of our Church in Constantinople: it has been, and still is, a cause of many evils: this it is which has put us to shame before the Westerns. See, then, to yourselves, lest ye also, by a proceeding hitherto unprecedented among you, set a precedent for a ruinous custom. If then Kyr Nicon says: 'I did not renounce my chair, but I renounced him that was disobedient,' it is clear that he rebukes the people for disobedience. Show, then, to him *the proper obedience*, as to the steward of the divine grace; obedience (ὑπείδειαν) I say, not such as is unusual for the Churches of God, but that which the sacred laws enjoin. But his renunciation, which some say he made before the Church, may be condescendingly condoned for the sake of peace; and the more so because he, Kyr Nicon, as we have said, renounced the disobedient people, and not the chair. But even if he had renounced the chair, and had made a written act of his resignation, still

the matter may be condoned. For ofttimes such renunciations are without effect. For the patriarch Gennadius of blessed memory, who was patriarch of C.P. after the capture of the city, says in one of his epistles written to the monks of Mount Sinai, the original of which we there saw, and of which we possess a copy, that the renunciation of a bishop is void unless it be accepted and confirmed by the patriarch (that is, if the bishop resigning be a metropolitan), or by the synod if such a one be a patriarch.[54] In the time of our own patriarchate in the holy city of Jerusalem a metropolitan named Dorotheus, of the see of Petra, which is under the chair of Jerusalem, repeatedly asked to be allowed to resign his see, which is beyond Jordan, and which contains only three or four settlements of Christian Arabs besides the place itself where that metropolitan resides. But as he was a virtuous man, able both by deed and word to confirm the Christians who are there, we did not consent that he should resign. At last, after he had asked permission many times, he brought to us also his written abdication; but we disallowed it, and he still holds his see. Again, Kyr Cyril, who was patriarch after Kyr Timothy, being aged, and wishing to be rid of the cares of the patriarchate, gave in a written abdication to his synod, and there was raised to fill his place Kyr Neophytus, who was then metropolitan of Heraclea. But after this some of the first metropolitans, and those of the most eminent, having been informed of it, hastened from their dioceses to C.P.; and not being pleased at the abdication of Cyril, they annulled it; and having provided for the retirement of Neophytus, with his consent, a decent maintenance from the revenues of the church, they raised Cyril afresh to the chair, neither from their friendship for Cyril nor of any enmity against Neophytus, but because Cyril was a most able and experienced administrator of the church. But do thou, O divine and sacred head, follow the rule of the wise Gennadius, which says that *an abdication which is not confirmed is void.* For we shall find, if we examine accurately, many other ancient examples also agreeing with the rule of Gennadius. This Gennadius is the same who, at the desire

[54] In the Greek, εἴγε μητροπολίτης ἐστὶν ὁ παραιτούμενος, ἢ ὑπὸ τῆς ... (the word συνόδου has dropped out), εἴγε πατριάρχης ἐστὶν ὁ τοιοῦτος. The Slav. translation would be 'abdicatio episcopi invalida est, nisi confirmata fuerit a patriarchâ: *similiter et* abdicatio metropolitæ et patriarchæ.'

of the sultan Mahomet after he had taken C.P., composed and presented to him in writing those most wise and theological statements of the Christian faith, for which he was exceedingly respected by the same sultan.

But the case of your patriarch Kyr Nicon is totally different. For he neither gave in *to his own synod* any written resignation, nor was the resignation which he uttered orally accepted by your holy majesty, nor by all the people. An indisputable proof of this is the fact, that to this day your holy majesty is inviting him to return. And so from on all sides it is clear that his resignation is of no force, if indeed it was ever made at all.[55] You ought then, as we have said, again to invite him to return.

And behold we write also to him fraternally, admonishing him that he did not well to leave the capital, and to live away from it. *If it please*[56] thy holy majesty, send to him this our said letter, for it too is accompanied by a translation as well as this present.

And thus far we have done what we can (*καὶ ταῦτα μὲν εἰς τοσοῦτο, μὴ δυνάμενοι κ.τ.λ.*), not being able ourselves to go, nor even at present to send our clerks (*ἡμετέρους ἀνθρώπους*), to the compassion of thy holy majesty for help for the ten thousand debts of the holy and lifegiving sepulchre.

But if God be pleased to permit it hereafter, perhaps we will send, since it is a thing altogether impossible for us to go ourselves, for the reasons which will be explained orally by the Christians here present [Slav. 'who will take these letters'], thy servants and faithful ministers of the Lord's sepulchre, Sebastus son of Demetrius, Demetrius son of George, and Pius, whom we beg thy holy majesty to receive graciously to its [*i.e.* to thy] most serene encouragement and good hope.[57]

Furthermore, we state clearly this also, in addition [to what

[55] *εἶπε* (a misprint or slip of the pen for *εἶπου* or *εἶγε*) *καὶ ὅλως ἐγένετο.* The Slav. has 'sit invalida et consistit solummodo in ejus verbis.'

[56] But so far was it from 'pleasing his majesty' that he intercepted and suppressed this letter of a brother patriarch to Nicon, just as he intercepted and suppressed a letter written a little later by Nicon to the patriarch of C.P.; and the bearers of Nectarius's letters to the tsar and to Nicon, and of Nicon's letter to the patriarch of C.P., were both of them *thrown into prison;* where the latter of the two, for fear of the rack, even committed suicide. O holy tsar! O apostolical liberty of patriarchs and synods! O dutiful protection and guardianship exercised by the 'eldest son of the Church'!

[57] *εἰς τὸ γαληνότατόν της θάρρος καὶ ἐλπίδα ἀγαθήν.* These words are omitted by the Slav. translation.

has been said above] to thy holy majesty: that if Kyr Nicon be invited yet once and again to return to his chair, and will not, ye can *then* act as the heads of the tome direct: and this will be altogether unexceptionable. For it is not right that the capital city should be without a spiritual pastor. So that it is every way necessary, either that he return, or that another be raised instead of him to the chair. Nevertheless, it will be much better that you should make him to return, for the reasons which we have given. May God the almighty king, the giver of peace and tranquillity, preserve the power of thy divine-granted empire for a long succession of thy most sacred and most imperial race! Written in the year 1664, March 20. The humble Nectarius, by the mercy of God patriarch of the holy city of Jerusalem. (Roumantseff's *Collection*, &c., vol. iv. p. 134-141.)

VIII.

At p. 82-92 Paisius relates how Athanasius metropolitan of Iconium, who pretended to be a relative (*ἀνεψιὸς*) of the patriarch of C.P., and to be charged with a mission of pacification from him, cast doubt on the patriarchal tome with the twenty-five Questions and Answers brought to Moscow by Meletius on Whitsunday, 29th May, in A.D. 1664 (see above, p. 82), contending that the signatures of the four patriarchs were forgeries; the fact being that he had been told by the patriarch Nectarius in Moldavia, out of a too diplomatic caution, that the patriarchs had given Meletius *nothing*. Athanasius, no doubt, brought the *usual* letters from C.P. for the tsar, and probably also for the patriarch Nicon, though these latter were not suffered to reach him; and he may have obtained permission, or taken the liberty, like others, to call himself *ἀνεψιὸς*, even if he were not actually a relative of the patriarch of C.P. But his own mere assertion (contradicted too, seemingly, by the patriarch Dionysius himself) is no sort of proof that he was charged with any personal mission. And after all his name appears, together with those of the two patriarchs, and the other Greek bishops then at Moscow, as subscribing the synodal act *for the condemnation of Nicon* in 1666. So then it seems that, in spite of the bad character given him by themselves in the forged letter from C.P. to be found below (and see the notes at pp. 89, 235 of Paisius' *History*), he was

not thought unworthy to sit in their synagogue if only he could be persuaded to do so, and that he was not proof either against continued severities, or against those ulterior fears or hopes through which it was sought to *enlighten* him. Paisius, however, writes at p. 90 that, after being confuted for the second time in A.D. 1665, he was kept in confinement in the Simonoff till the arrival of the patriarchs in 1666, '*or rather till his untimely death.*' If so, what is to be said of his signature, which seems to attest that he sat in the synod of 1666, and joined in the condemnation of Nicon?

1. *From Solovieff's 'History of Russia,' &c.*

But neither did these Answers of the patriarchs help forward the affair of Nicon. Nicon had *a strong party* among the Greeks, which, *with the passionateness of the south, began to be agitated* when they knew of the arrival at C.P. of Meletius, and began to use all means to thwart him. From Nicon's *partisans* among the Greeks at Moscow there came letters to C.P., representing that Nicon—is another Chrysostom—that the tsar loves him, and used to go by night to him, to converse with him, but the boyars hate him because he urges the tsar to make war on the Tatars, who carry off into captivity the Muscovites and the Kozaks, whereas the boyars do not like to go out to war, nor to be forced away from their easy life at Moscow. They wrote that Nicon loves the Greeks, and is a zealous defender of the doctrines of the Eastern Church; they wrote that the letters and writings brought by Meletius have been composed by Ligarides, whom the boyars have bought by money and honours; that there had been given to Meletius eight thousand pieces of gold, by the help of which he had succeeded in obtaining that the answers should be given against Nicon. An archimandrite *from the patriarchate of Antioch* uttered *all this* in the presence of the patriarch of C.P. himself, and then went and cried it about all Constantinople, seeking after Meletius. Still more *violently* were the Constantinople Greeks *agitated*[58] by a certain clerk named Michael, who had a letter from his father-in-law Anastasius, from Moscow, about the eight thousand gold pieces brought by Meletius. But Meletius, on his side, *wrote to Ligarides*, that a cer-

[58] One would think that Nicon was a bone of contention between contrary factions in some free and democratical country.

tain Emmanuel Maival had *secretly* promised the two patriarchs [of C.P. and Jerusalem] fifteen thousand gold pieces if they would only *give no answers* in condemnation of Nicon; and not succeeding in this, *he* had *sought to kill* Meletius. The letters representing that Nicon was suffering for having advised war against the Tatars, who wasted both Great and Little Russia, would necessarily make a special impression on the Greeks of C.P., who were in the habit of seeing three and four ships in a day arrive at their city full of Russian captives; and of seeing priests, virgins, monks, and youths, exposed for sale in the slave-markets: crowds of them were shipped off to Egypt to be sold there: some of these captives voluntarily renounced Christianity, others were compelled to apostatise by force.

But *the partisans of Nicon* were not content with exciting the Greeks of C.P. against Meletius: *they* determined to make use of a desperate expedient in Moscow itself. *They gave the tsar to understand* that there had arrived the metropolitan of Iconium Athanasius, with the quality of exarch; that he is a nephew [or relative] of the patriarch of C.P., and has been sent from him and from all the synod. When presented to the tsar, Athanasius began to speak with unusual solemnity: 'The patriarch of C.P. and all the synod sent me, and bade me say: As the Lord God came to his disciples when the doors were shut, and said: Peace be with you! so I, in the name of the patriarch of C.P. and all the synod, say to thee, Hossoudar! Be reconciled to the patriarch Nicon, and invite him back to the chair, to sit there as before.' Alexis Michaelovich thought it strange that this preacher of peace should have been sent without letters, to bid them verbally invite Nicon back. 'Dost thou know of the mission of Meletius?' asked the tsar of Athanasius. 'I do know of it,' he replied: 'the patriarchs did not receive Meletius, nor take from him thy letters and alms.' 'How so?' continued the tsar: 'Meletius wrote to me quite another story.' Athanasius, standing before the image of the Saviour, declared that Meletius wrote what was false. But, behold, before long there arrives Meletius himself [29 May 1664], and brings the Answers subscribed by the patriarchs. The tsar called a council of the Russian and Greek clergy to attest the subscriptions. The synod declared that the subscriptions were genuine. Athanasius alone at first denied their genuineness, but at last he too confessed

that the subscriptions were genuine. Afterwards it became known what it was that had decided him so confidently to tax Meletius with falsehood: he had asked *the patriarch of Jerusalem Nectarius* [at C.P., or in Moldavia?] what determination had they come to respecting the affair of Nicon? and he *out of caution* told him that they had given Meletius *no answer at all, nor set their hands to any writing whatever.*[59]

However that might be, the tsar was not set at rest. The patriarchs might subscribe Answers, and yet at the same time ask that the scandalous affair should be dropped, and that there should ensue a reconciliation with Nicon. To proceed against Nicon on the basis of the Answers sent by the patriarchs was more than the tsar ventured upon. He knew with whom he had to do: he knew how Nicon would begin to thunder against a synod which rested on dead letters which had just before been a matter of dispute, and in which Nicon was not so much as named. To put a definitive end to the scandal, and to quiet his own conscience, he needed the personal presence of the patriarchs themselves; and this the more, inasmuch as in the violently-developed *strife of the two parties* it was difficult to rely on the honesty of the means used in these distant relations and intercommunications with the patriarchs. The pretended mission of Athanasius of Iconium was not the only one of the kind. The monk Sabba was sent [early in 1666?] to the patriarch [then ex-patriarch] of C.P. Dionysius. 'Holy lord,' said he to Dionysius, 'the tsar Alexis Michaelovich beseeches thee: Come to Moscow; bless his house, and set to rights many urgent matters; and determine what the tsar is to do; whether he is to beg the patriarch Nicon to return, or is he to appoint another? Also he asks: Was Athanasius the metropolitan of Iconium sent by thee? and is he a relative of thine? Didst thou commission him verbally to recommend that Nicon should be asked by us to return? How many were the writings that thou didst send by the deacon Meletius? Was the Greek Stephen received by thee? and didst thou send by him a letter appointing the metropolitan of Gaza to be thy exarch?' 'To go to Moscow is utterly impossible for me,' replied Dionysius.

[59] He may also have said something in presence of Athanasius as to the expediency of inviting Nicon to return to the chair; and upon this Athanasius may have based his pretended mission from the patriarchs and their synod.

'I bless the tsar [*i.e.* the tsar has my consent and blessing] *either* to *pardon* Nicon, or to appoint another *who is humble and meek* [in his room]. If he fears to appoint another, *we will take the sin on our own heads.* The tsar is absolute sovereign ('samoderjets,' autocrat): *everything is possible for him.* Meletius came hither [to C.P. is meant, but Dionysius was now at Thessalonica] without sufficient secrecy [lit. 'not humbly enough,' too openly]; all the Turks knew about him; and he *caused me the loss of* 200 *purses* [which ought in equity to be made up to me?]. The metropolitan of Iconium Athanasius is *no relation* of mine. He had a debt owing to the Turks: he asked for a delay of a week, and went off: I gave him no commission, not a single word: *let them keep him close*, and *by no means let him go:* if the tsar lets him go, *he will do the greatest harm to the Church.* When the deacon Meletius came, we, with the patriarch Nectarius [of Jerusalem], wrote two writings [or tomes], word for word the same, and subscribed them with our hands; and we sent one by Meletius to Alexandria [or to Cairo, to be subscribed by the patriarch Paisius of Alexandria], while Nectarius sent the other by a monk of his own to Antioch [*i.e.* to Damascus, to be subscribed there by the patriarch Macarius of Antioch]. The Greek Stephen was never *received* by me: only the artophylax [chartophylax] *bothered me* that *I should write in a letter* that the metropolitan of Gaza was to be my exarch. But *I gave him no permission for this:* and if any such letter has been exhibited to the tsar, that is a spurious document devised [literally 'tares sown'] by the artophylax [chartophylax]. As for Paisius Ligarides, he is not a scion of the chair of C.P.; *nor do I call him orthodox;* for I hear from many that he is a *papist*, and a *bad man.* And as for the Greek Stephen, do not let him go free either;[60] for he has done great mischief to the orthodox Church, no less than Athanasius of Iconium.[61]

[60] These requests (identical with what occurs in the forged letter appointing Paisius Ligarides exarch) to keep in *confinement* in Muscovy Greeks who had been doing nothing unusual for Greek ecclesiastics to do for some hope of gain (See *Travels of Macarius*, p. 105, 147), nor anything specially injurious to their own Church in the Levant, however much they might have offended the Muscovite boyars or the tsar, may well excite suspicions: in any case, such vindictive recommendations of men not much worse than their fellows to the tender mercies of foreign tyranny are not likely to have been quite spontaneous.

[61] Compare Paisius' *History*, &c. p. 91, 92. One sees *why* very little was communicated to *Paisius* respecting this mission of Sabba.

To the other three patriarchs the same Meletius [the friend of Paisius Ligarides, who had before been sent with the xxv. Questions] was sent again [in the autumn of 1664], with the following instructions from the tsar: 'Without fail so to manage matters, that the patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem, and the ex-patriarch of C.P. Paisius, or at the least two of them, viz. the patriarchs of Antioch and Jerusalem, should come to Moscow. But for them that may prefer to send others to represent them, instead of coming themselves, to *insist strongly* that they send such bishops as are good, learned, judicious, sincere (not double-tongued), firm, just, capable of discerning and judging the work of God justly, not desirous of reward and flattery, not fearing with any kind of fear except the fear of the judgment of God. And thou, Meletius, when thou art with the œcumenical patriarchs, speak no *superfluous* words about the patriarch Nicon, *but only* [what is required for] *justice*.'

Meletius, in January A.D. 1665, found Nectarius the patriarch of Jerusalem in Moldavia; and did *not himself go to him*, but sent with the tsar's letter the Greek Stephen [the same whom, according to Solovieff's own account given above, the patriarch Dionysius later recommended the tsar to keep in prison as a rogue and an accomplice in forgery] and the under-secretary Oloveninoff. 'The great hossoudar,' said these envoys to Nectarius, 'begs and entreats thee that thou wouldst be pleased to undertake the labour—for the work of Christ—of going into the Muscovite empire.' 'The great hossoudar,' replied Nectarius, 'sent to us all the Greek Meletius; and he knows that I purposely went into Moldavia, that I might from hence go on [*i.e.* without danger or difficulties from the Turks] to Moscow. But owing to the war it was utterly impossible for me to go on. We sent by Meletius to the great hossoudar canonical directions [lit. '*pravila*,' canones]: and how is it that hitherto *nothing has been done* in pursuance[62] of them?' Oloveninoff related how the metropolitan of Iconium Athanasius had come, and how the genuineness of the subscriptions had been

[62] But what of Nectarius's own separate letter of 20th March 1664, and the sarcastic answer now about to be made to it (in Jan. 1665) by the tsar and his secretary Ligarides? and what of the bearer of that letter, whom they are now keeping in prison for his pains? About all which Nectarius might at least inquire before expressing his surprise that nothing has yet been done in pursuance of the patriarchal tome.

attested. And when Nectarius a second time asked why, after all, nothing had been done in pursuance of those canonical directions [canons], the genuineness of which had been attested? Oloveninoff replied: 'Without [the presence of] an œcumenical patriarch it is impossible to summon Nicon, and to appoint another in his stead. Moreover the great hossoudar has *other* matters, which cannot without you by any means be settled. All the order of the Church is in confusion: in the churches every one ministers as he pleases; and there is no shepherd.' Nectarius promised to go to Moscow: 'I will go,' he said, 'though it cost me my life. For I consider the great hossoudar as the œcumenical tsar: he is the only christian tsar, our only hope and boast.' However, Nectarius did *not* go to Moscow. He sent to the tsar a letter[63] in which he recommended him to invite Nicon to return to the patriarchal chair, showing him the Answers of the œcumenical patriarchs sent [from Nectarius himself, and at the same time with his own separate messenger] by Meletius, as a rule for his future conduct: 'and if he will promise to be guided by them, then in that case he deserves forgiveness.' He begged the tsar 'not to lend his ears to the counsels of envious people, who love dissension, especially if such be of the spiritual order. In our present circumstances,' wrote Nectarius, 'when our Church is under the yoke of bondage, we are like ships ready to be engulfed by incessant storms; and it is in your Russian Church alone that we see the ark of Noah.' Nectarius exhorts the tsar to follow the meekness of David, and not to introduce during his reign a bad and ruinous precedent for changing patriarchs who are orthodox in the doctrines of faith. He says that it is not possible to attach much weight to Nicon's abdication. He gives examples of cases in which the abdications of bishops had been annulled. As regards the case of Nicon, he did not even give in any written resignation. The tsar and the people did not accept that resignation which he did make, and which consisted only in words. Nectarius concludes that it is absolutely necessary either to restore Nicon, or to raise to his place another; but that it will be far better to determine on the first course. Nectarius was given to understand that

[63] But this had been written and sent at the same time with the patriarchal tomes nearly a year before, and was dated 20th March, A.D. 1664.

Ligarides aspires to the title of patriarchal exarch,[64] and already so styles himself at Moscow. Hereupon the patriarch instructed the envoy sent to him to make it known at Moscow that *nobody* had been invested with the quality of exarch. Nectarius also desired [in his letter of 1664] that they should receive no persons as envoys from the patriarchs unless their letters bear the patriarchal seal: he requested that they would give the patriarchal letters to translate not to Greeks, but to the tsar's translators; because the Greeks pervert the sense of the letters. It is easy to see how these suggestions of the necessity of caution increased the perplexity and anxiety of the tsar, and made him desire that personal presence of the patriarchs which would decide everything. And Meletius succeeded in persuading two of them, Macarius of Antioch and Paisius of Alexandria, to go to Moscow (vol. xi. p. 330 to 361, S.P.B. 1861).

2. *A Letter of Athanasius metropolitan of Iconium to Nicon.*

Note prefixed on the MS. 'This letter is written by Athanasius to inform Nicon of the spuriousness of certain letters [the patriarchal Answers or tome] which had been brought to Moscow . . . [here the writing is no longer legible] . . . and giving testimony . . . [about] the metropolitan of Gaza . . . [that] he is an enemy of God, a destroyer, not a shepherd . . . and wicked . . . and thence he wrote this.' And at the end of the MS. there is *another note*, which, like that prefixed, is now only in part legible, thus: 'This Athanasius was sent from the patriarch of C.P. with letters to the tsar's majesty *and to the patriarch Nicon*. . . . They sent him Athanasius into a monastery [the Simonoff, into confinement], and thence he wrote this.'

My most holy and blessed and wise father, and patriarch of the great city of Moscow and of all Russia, thirteenth apostle, and judge of Great and Little and White Russia, my father and lord (vladiko), Kyr Kyr (Hospodi, Hospodi) Nicon! I salute thy blessed soul, and do my reverence and bow to the earth, and kiss thy hands and thy feet in thought through this my letter.

[64] When? and by what messenger? for this could not be by *Stephen* in Jan. 1665, but must have been later. Solovieff would have done better if he had given more frequent and more exact *references* to those documents which he was permitted to use, and if, in putting together extracts from different documents, he had given them always in their proper order, and with the true date of each.

I pray the Almighty to vouchsafe me to see thee in the body, and for that cause now, hearing thy holy name, I rejoice. I have come hither, O my holy lord, solely for peace. They who love not justice desire only falsehood. I was sent by thy brother the patriarch of Constantinople, for the sake of peace *with the boyars:* and I told them what he had instructed me; and so they have sent me hither [into imprisonment]; and of my people some they have sent to Siberia, and others I know not whither; only I thank God: God will judge the world, and will give them their due recompense, according to what they do. There are Greeks who bring forged letters, only to obtain money; so the boyars believe them, and they like that better than justice.

And while your beatitude teaches according to the gospel, they pay no attention; rather they are more actively malicious. No one patriarch will give any letters to them. Thy beatitude will be again patriarch of Moscow: it shall not be otherwise: and may thy holy prayers be with me! Athanasius, the last servant of thy high-priesthood, metropolitan of Iconium and Cappadocia.

3. *Answer of Nicon to Athanasius.*

Nicon, by the mercy of God patriarch, to the more than most blessed, the new confessor for righteousness' sake, the most reverend Athanasius, metropolitan of Iconium and of Cappadocia, hail!

I received thy second letter, and kissed the work of thine honourable hands, and so [in thought] the hands themselves which wrote it; and I often look at it, and read it over, and so solace myself in my great affliction. However, before anything else, I must write and ask thy beatitude to forgive me, that I have been so long in sending thee an answer, owing to my having been very ill with bodily illness. But for what thy beatitude writes, and prayest to the Almighty God to vouchsafe thee to see me in the body, I am a poor sinful body, without enlightenment, nor can such as I enlighten others; but rather we ought to seek out and visit thy beatitude, who art in bonds and bitter exile for righteousness' sake. So the Lord commands: 'I was in prison, and ye came to me.' However, the present form of malice leaves us not opportunity to go anywhither to fulfil this commandment, as thou knowest and hearest. But what else to say I know not. We know that God himself speaks of charity

thus: 'Greater love than this can no man have, that a man should lay down his life for his friends: ye are my friends, if ye do those things which I command you.' And who can believe all that we hear and collect about the ill-treatment to which thou art subjected? If the Lord himself testifies that there is no greater love than this, that a man should lay down his life for his friends, then for this, and on account of the commandment, thou art the friend of God, *if thou fulfil it* [*to the end*]. For this cause the Saviour continually commands, saying: 'Remember the word which I spake unto you: The servant is not greater than his lord: if they have cast me out, they will also cast you out: if they have kept my word, they will also keep yours.' And Peter the prince of the Apostles writes: 'Because Christ also suffered for us, leaving us an example, that we should follow his steps,' &c. And again: 'For as much, then, as Christ hath suffered for us in the flesh, arm yourselves likewise with the same mind' (1 Pet. ii. 21; iv. 1). And the divine apostle Paul teaches us, saying: 'Let us run with patience the race that is set before us, looking unto Jesus, the author and finisher of our faith; who for the joy that was set before him endured the cross, despising the shame, and is set down at the right hand of the throne of God' (Heb. xii. 1, 2). And to the Corinthians he writes: 'Therefore I take pleasure in infirmities, in reproaches, in necessities, in persecutions, in distresses for Christ's sake' (2 Cor. xii. 10). But that we may know what sort of a reward is prepared for them that are persecuted and evil-entreated for Christ's sake, hear the Lord himself: 'Blessed,' he says, 'are they that are persecuted for righteousness' sake, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven.' . . . He not only promises, but he adds, that the reward is *great*. He continues and says: 'Blessed are ye when men shall revile you, and persecute you, and say all manner of evil of you, falsely, for my name's sake: rejoice, and be exceeding glad; for great is your reward in heaven.' But we, following the example of the apostles, beseech thy beatitude: 'Cast not away thy confidence, which hath great recompense of reward: for thou hast need of patience, that after having done the will of God, thou mayest receive the promise which God has promised to them that love him' (Heb. x. 35, 36). But for that thou sayest, that they love not justice, not only do they themselves not love it, but them that love it they hate and persecute.

However, Christ himself has said: 'For so persecuted they also the prophets who were before you.' But for that thou art grieved for thy people, some of whom they have sent to Siberia, and others they have sent thou knowest not whither; grieve not, my brother, for that which befalls thee in doing good: for they are not thy people only whom they, on account of us, have persecuted and exiled. Very many besides are they—how many we ourselves know not—who after our departure from Moscow were sent into exile in different directions and persecuted, some even to death; and who now are suffering in distant exiles, bishops, and archimandrites, and priests, and deacons, with their wives and children, all sorts of severities. However, no man of them will be absent from the judgment of God. They will stand all, as it is written, in the day of judgment with great confidence before the face of them that afflicted them, &c. Grieve not, brother, in well-doing, but suffer as a good soldier of Christ. Hear the prophet of God, who blesses thee, and says: 'Blessed are they that walk in his commandments;' and again: 'Blessed is the man that feareth the Lord; he hath great delight in his commandments: his seed shall be mighty upon earth.'...

4. *Another later Letter of Athanasius to Nicon.*

To the most illustrious, and most wise, and most blessed father, and patriarch of Moscow and all Russia, Kyr Kyr Nicon, wishing joy in Christ: and I kiss thy holy hand and most humbly salute it. I have a wish [to do so]; and I inform thy divine patronage, holy lord, that I have heard thy holy name [named in connection with] unspeakable kindness to strangers, how that thou lovest them, and clothest them as a loving father. And for this the Lord shall reward thee in the kingdom of heaven, and thou shalt hear the happy and blessed voice of the Lord saying: 'Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom of heaven, prepared for you from the foundation of the world.' So also the prophet David says: 'Every day the just man shows mercy, and is liberal, and his seed is blessed' [Ps. xxxv. 26].

My wise father! the falsehood of the wicked Ligarides came to the full, according to the words of thy most blessed brother [the patriarch of Constantinople]. He sent a writing, and excommunicated him, and anathematised him: he calls him 'a

papist, and a bad and false man.' And when he was for the second time at Constantinople . . . the patriarch of Constantinople sought to take him, and to put him into prison; but he got away, and went I know not whither. Now they are all blind; and they all listen to him alone. When my godson shall come, I will then write of all to thy high-priesthood; and he will bring letters to me. Only, I pray, forget me not in thy private prayers. Pray to God for us: for my affliction is great and overwhelming; and that work longs for justice about which I have been commissioned, and for which I am suffering here in a strange land. And for my own losses and confinement I do not grieve; it is on account of my people only: in that I suffer, as St. Eustathius suffered: one took away his wife, and a wolf took one of his children, and a bear the other; and he did not lament, but only rejoiced in God in his afflictions. So I also, poor man, and the servant of thy high-priesthood, have thy holy letter which thou hast sent me, and when I read it I rejoice. And may the blessing of thy high-priesthood be with me. (1665, June 22). The last servant of thy high-priesthood, Athanasius, metropolitan of Iconium and Cappadocia.

5. *Answer of Nicon to the preceding Letter.*

Nicon, by the mercy of God patriarch, to the most blessed Athanasius metropolitan [of Iconium and Cappadocia], grace, mercy, and peace, from God the Father and from our Lord Jesus Christ. Thy second letter written to us we have read, and have understood its contents perfectly: and we bless heartily thy beatitude for that thou bearest not in vain the name of *immortality* (*Athanasius*), but showest also works and a will worthy of that name. The Lord give thee the zeal of Phinehas of old against that worker of [spiritual] adultery, the lawless Ligarides: and take thou the spiritual sword to pierce the evil heart and thought; and that shall be fulfilled which is written in the Psalms: 'Then stood up Phinehas, and pleased God, and so the plague was stayed: and that was counted unto him for righteousness, unto all generations for evermore' (Ps. cv. 30, 31).

Thy beatitude writes that 'the falsehood of the wicked Ligarides came to the full, according to the words of our most blessed brother [the patriarch of Constantinople]; and he sent a writing and excommunicated him, and anathematised him as a papist,

and an evil man.' With just cause, O brother, our brother the patriarch did thus to him. However, the holy Church cries out, and says without ceasing: 'Cursed are they that do swerve from thy commandments.' But that bad man Ligarides never thinks of doing any good thing according to the commandments, but *he thinks perversely, how to please not God but men.* And therefore he shall have his bones scattered, according to that which is written in the Psalms, by the Lord God as a men-pleaser. And again thou writest that 'when he was the second time at Constantinople, . . . the patriarch sought to take him and to put him in prison; but he got away. And now they are all blind.' The Lord says: 'There is nothing secret that shall not be made manifest, neither anything hid that shall not be known and come abroad' (Luke viii. 17). 'Therefore whatsoever ye have spoken in darkness shall be heard in the light; and that which ye have spoken in the ear in closets shall be proclaimed upon the housetops' (Luke xii. 3). What a war do not those evil men make upon me now for seven years, and say all that they say falsely! and yet they prevail not; because the Lord fighteth for us. Moreover, thy beatitude informs us that thy godson is coming, and that then thou wilt write to us. Thou wilt do well if thou givest us information.

Farther, we write to beg thy beatitude to send us that book which thou didst purpose to send us, on the *Judgment of Bishops.* I had a copy of it before, which was given to me at Moscow by a holy man, Dionysius archbishop of Achrida; but at the time of my departure from Moscow, I left it there with the rest of the books and other property; and by ukaz of the tsar the boyars [*i.e.* the council] broke open all the locks, and took away whatever they pleased. And that book too they took; and I know not where it is now.

But for this that thou desirest us not to forget thee in our private prayers, be sure that we pray God [not only so, but] together with all the community for thy beatitude. And farther thy beatitude writes that thy grief is great and overwhelming, and thou longest for justice in the matter with which thou wert commissioned. *If thou hast received a commission,* fail not to execute it. The commandment of God enjoins this on thee, saying: 'He that heareth you heareth me,' &c. But suffer as a good soldier of Christ. Thou art troubled that thou art suffering

in a strange land: 'The earth is the Lord's, and the fulness thereof.' And the divine Apostle says: 'We have not here any abiding city, but we look for one to come.' And the Lord himself says: 'The foxes have holes, and the birds of the air have nests; but the Son of man hath not where to lay his head.' The writer of the Proverbs says: 'My son, if thou settest thyself to serve the Lord, prepare thy soul for trials.' And thou, brother, fret not in well-doing: the trust of one that trusts in God will not fail him. The Lord testifies: 'According unto thy faith be it unto thee.' And again elsewhere it is written: 'Abraham believed God, and it was accounted unto him for righteousness; and he was called the friend of God.' And if thou believest that the Lord God is able to deliver thee, so it shall be unto thee; as it is written in the Psalms: 'Many are the troubles of the righteous; and the Lord shall deliver them out of all. The Lord keepeth all their bones, so that not one of them shall be broken.' Farewell, brother, and faint not at the chastening of the Lord; nor be weary of it: for whom the Lord loveth he chasteneth. Meditate continually the history of Job: 'The Lord gave, and the Lord hath taken away:' and pray also for us, that we may be saved. Written in the monastery of Voskresensk.

6. *From Solovieff's 'History of Russia,' &c.*

In the archives of the prikaz of secret service at Moscow there is a paper *professing to be* a letter from Dionysius patriarch of C.P. to the tsar, dated [or translated at Moscow?] 12th Nov. A.M. 7174 [it should be 7173, and so Nov. in A.D. 1664, from which Solovieff quotes as follows]:

'About the affair of Nicon we some time ago took great pains, with great attention: and we put together heads in two tomes, duplicates, exactly alike, declaring moreover that the aforesaid heads in those two tomes are promulgated in this sense, as respects thy most illustrious majesty, that the patriarch appointed in these parts must govern *according to thy pleasure and command*, like the *other* members of the synclete: for it is not good that there be *two heads* in one monarchy; but let there be *one supremacy*. That accursed Athanasius, instigated by the father of lies, the devil, as his instrument, *without any mission whatever*, went thither [to Moscow] giving false witness

against the tomes, and against the canonical heads contained in them: for he said falsely that he *was sent from us*, and that *he is our relative*.[65] Know that he is a foul vessel of corruption, and a man of evil designs, who has many years ago been *cast out of the Church*. Therefore *let him be sent to some place to weep for his soul*, and let him *never return* to our countries to the day of his death. And *let this our denunciation* [of him] *be kept quite secret*; or rather let thy most illustrious majesty *tear it up into the smallest tatters*, that it be seen by no one, *for many reasons*, that it be not heard of by *any other* person.

'*We* have appointed Kyr Paisius, *the holy and intelligent* metropolitan of Gaza, and *have sent him faculties*, as to a man of discretion and skilled in ecclesiastical affairs of this kind, *appointing him to be our vicar*, to *defend those canonical Chapters*, and *to solve every difficulty and doubt objected from the other side*, and to *direct the trial* in conjunction with the sacred synod of the local bishops, *presiding* in it as representing our *persona* (sic) in that one affair to its final settlement' [Solovieff's *History, &c.* vol. xi. p. 469. Compare Paisius' *History, &c.* ch. xxiii. p. 89, and what the ex-patriarch of C.P. Dionysius himself says of this letter (above, p. 360) to the monk Sabbas, who was sent to him to Thessalonica].

IX.

At p. 85: '*Nicon, on hearing of this second mission, gnashed his teeth*,' &c. Of the same Solovieff writes thus:

'On hearing this for him terrible news, that the patriarchs were coming for a council, Nicon wrote to the tsar a letter [from which the following are extracts] . . . "We do not decline a synod; rather we praise thy intention as godly, if the patriarchs are themselves minded to come hither and to judge of all according to the divine commandments of the gospel, and according to the canons of the apostles and the holy fathers. Yea verily, we are nothing loath. But first we entreat thy nobility to listen to this our little word of admonition with meekness and patience. Thy nobility thought proper to call together after our departure the metropolitans bishops and archimandrites to pass a judgment, contrary to the divine commandments, because there is no such commandment [or canon] as authorises bishops to judge their patriarch, especially when they have been ordained by him, and

[65] Comp. *Travels of Macarius*, &c. p. 105.

to judge him too in his absence." After writing out the account given in the gospels of the judicial proceedings against Christ, Nicon continues thus: "See, most Christian tsar! even in the midst of that fierce envy of the Jews nothing was done which was without the form of law, or without witnesses, or in the absence of the accused, though in everything they acted unjustly. 'Therefore,' he said, 'he that delivered me unto thee hath the greater sin.' So also here he that moved thy nobility against us hath the greater sin. If the council will condemn me only for my departure, it must depose (or cast out) similarly even Christ himself, because he ofttimes went away on account of the malice of the Jews. When thy nobility was in good counsel and charity with us, and once, on account of the hatred of the people, we wrote to thee that it was impossible to defend us in the great church (*ne zlia nam predstatelstvovat:* perhaps an error for *predstoiati*, 'impossible for us to appear'), what was then thy answer and superscription? That letter of thine is deposited in a certain church in a secret place, which no man besides ourselves knows of. But do thou look to it, O religious tsar! that no evil come upon thee from these thy letters, nor this turn to thy condemnation before God, and before *the œcumenical council convoked by thee*. I write this not from any desire of the patriarchal chair; my wish is that the holy Church should be without disturbance, and that thou mayest not in the sight of the Lord God incur sin: I write, not fearing for myself a great council, but not wishing to bring on thy sacred empire disgrace; because if in the presence of two or three witnesses every word shall be established, how much more in the presence of a multitude? Our bishops accuse us only from one canon of the First and Second council, which does not apply to our case. But when there shall be adduced against themselves a multitude of canons which none of them can possibly evade, then, I think, there will not be left a single bishop nor a single priest [among them who will appear to be canonically] worthy of his place. The Russian bishops at their consecration all of them do reverence to the patriarch of Constantinople. Then they will know their own work who now, as bats, trouble thy felicity, that is, the metropolitan of Kroutitz with John Nerenoff and the rest of his aiders and abettors. Thou hast sent [to the Levant] Meletius; but he is a good-for-nothing man, who subscribes in anybody else's hand, and counterfeits

seals. And here also there was a case of that kind against him, and [the papers about it are] now still in the patriarchal prikaz. You have plenty of people of your own, great hossoudar, without employing such a rogue as that." To this letter there was no reply.' These extracts from Nicon's letter are inserted, but without references, by Solovieff, immediately before his account of Nicon's coming to Moscow in the night before the 18th Dec. 1664. Vol. xi. p. 339, 340.

X.

In connection with the account given at p. 85-89 *of Nicon's return to Moscow in the night of* 18*th Dec.* A.D. 1664.

List of letters of the great hossoudar, which, by his special command (ukaz), were written by Paisius metropolitan of Gaza (in the spring of A.D. 1665).

1. To the most holy patriarch of C.P. Kyr Dionysius, containing an account of the coming of the ex-patriarch Nicon to the capital city of Moscow (18th Dec. 1664), so as to cause scandal to all the people, on the Sunday before Christmas, and of the other things done by him at the same time; viz. of his forcibly carrying off the primatial staff from the cathedral church, and of his shaking off the dust from his shoes, and making those with him to do the like.

2. To the patriarch of Jerusalem Kyr Nectarius, in which he is informed that the great hossoudar has received his, the patriarch's, papers [viz. the synodal tome, and Nectarius' separate letter to the tsar, and the other letter to be sent, if the tsar pleased, to Nicon]; and then he is also informed of the same occurrence, viz. of what the patriarch Nicon had done, in coming uninvited to the city, *which was clearly forbidden by the four œcumenical patriarchs.*

3. To the ex-patriarch of C.P. Parthenius, signifying to him the wish of the great hossoudar that he should come to Moscow, since he had the road open to him to come at will from Wallachia.

4. To Neophytus metropolitan of Adrianople, who had accompanied the ex-patriarch Parthenius to Wallachia, requesting that he should come, and that he would consult together with the ex-patriarch Parthenius for their both coming hither to Moscow.

1. *Translation* [*into Slavonic*] *of the letters of the great hossoudar to the œcumenical patriarch* (*i.e. to the patriarch of C.P.*) *and to the patriarch of Jerusalem.*

Alexis Michaelovich, by the mercy of God tsar and grand prince of Moscow, and autocrat of all Great, Little, and White Russia, and ruler and conqueror of many other principalities and lands in the east and in the west, and of all the northern region: to the preëminently most holy and œcumenical patriarch hospodin Kyr Dionysius gives due honour, and kisses his holy hands with reverence. 'Day unto day utters speech, and night unto night proclaims understanding,' sang the ancestor of God, playing on the seven-stringed harp. The same is true for us of Nicon, formerly in the patriarchal chair: for he is every day acting some novelties, that I may not say meditating some unlooked-for apostacy and defection. But why do we not relate from its commencement to thee, our most exceedingly-beloved father and judge, the very scandalous act which he did on the Sunday before Christmas? For without any sort of shame, with great audacity, he fell upon us in the middle of the night (it had been better that he had not done thus!) surrounded by a multitude of people; and having suddenly entered into our imperial precinct [the Kremlin], he rushed straight into the great church, with great arrogance, having a multitude of people about him; and he received the obeisance of many, and especially that of Jonah the metropolitan of Rostoff, and blessed him, as if he had come at an opportune moment and 'with happy steps' (εὐτυχεῖ ποδὶ), *as we read*, and went up to the exalted patriarchal throne, as if he were going to celebrate the festival of Christ's Nativity, and to pray with us for all good things for the synclete and for the world. But we, having learned previously *the righteous judgment of the four patriarchs*, directing that without a synodal invitation he by no means could come, nor was it allowable for him to come (or rather he had first to clear himself of all the mischiefs caused by him) to his former chair, were very greatly scandalised at such a stratagem, so as to say; and as he that invited the guests in the parable, so we then said: 'How camest thou in hither,' not being invited? Of many *that are called*, few, it is written, are chosen. But where shall we put them that are *not called* to the metropolis of this empire, but come violently with an

onslaught? For we could not have imagined ourselves even to dream of seeing such an *assault:* and when we heard of it (for we would not behold it with our eyes), we were moved more with zeal than with wrath, abominating an act of such impudence, that which was done being of surpassing audacity, a presumption plainly contrary to *the canons*, which all condemn any sort of *violence*. And who could describe the *seditious* excitement of the people, the *alarm of the boyars*, the agitation of the synclete, at the sudden news of this occurrence? In truth it was as if some great treason were threatening. The whole city, both within and without [the Kremlin], was agitated at such an inopportune and *uncanonical* return. Never before had any mischief like this occurred or been done, so entirely beyond all our anticipations. From henceforth we have no need to make complaints against Nicon on account of his former abdication, on account of his seven years' absence from the patriarchal chair, or on account of a certain apostacy [*i.e.* that of the Raskolniks] *caused by innovations made by him* which have occasioned that apostacy, but rather [we complain now] on account of this unjustifiable violence, *forbidden by the holy canons* of the councils. For Matthew Blastar says distinctly that this violence was so extremely hateful to the holy and blessed fathers, that they who met together in the Holy Ghost in the synod of Sardica made a canon that every one guilty of such violence should be accounted altogether abominable, and should not be admitted to communion even at the hour of death, but held utterly unworthy of the christian name, as being the cause of great scandal. But 'woe!' says He who is the original justice, 'to him by whom scandal cometh.'

He has done also another act of audacity. But do thou, O most holy patriarch, attend, and thou wilt be astounded. The pastoral staff of the metropolitan Peter, venerated by us all as a saint, which hung at the patriarchal place, he privily and *tyrannically* stole, and was hardly brought to give it up to those who *properly*[66] contended with him about it, and required it of him. Is not a man who does such things as these guilty of *sacrilege?* Must he not be punished for such a foul *robbery* as this? I will lift up my voice for *justice*. I will cry aloud; no man shall hinder me; or rather, all insist together with one voice and one

[66] See *Travels of Macarius*, p. 290. 'I fear the patriarch Nicon,' &c

mind. But where the voice of the people is, according to the common saying, it is understood as the voice of God.

But what, again, are we to say of this [fresh act which I have to add]; that it is a matter for astonishment, or for tears? Nicon at that time went away again 'willingly and unwillingly' from our imperial city. But, as he left, he bade his companions to shake off the dust from their feet, shaking it off first himself from his own with a certain horror, grounding himself, may be, on that word of Christ which commands: 'Into whatever city or village ye enter, inquire who in it is worthy, and there abide till ye depart. And whosoever will not receive you, nor hear your words, when ye go out from that house, or from that city, shake off the dust of your feet.' It is true that the Lord ordered that this should be done to them who refused to receive the pious preaching of the sacred and holy gospel, which we all of us, by the grace of God, as we received it from the beginning, so to this day hold unaltered, without having changed even the least point. Therefore it was without cause that this, like so many other things, was done by him; this shaking-off of the dust, that is, which had no propriety towards us, who are followers of Christ, and by no means rejecters of the holy sacraments. And we have been taught like Moses, who saw God, and who heard in old time that word: 'Put off thy shoes from thy feet, for the spot whereon thou standest is holy ground.' It was not proper then to shake off, but rather [it would have been proper] to collect the dust from your feet, since ye were standing in the holy church, whose very dust partakes of sanctification. But let it be allowed as *natural* for *Neikon* to do all sorts of strange things, since *Neikon* came not to make peace but to bring a sword against us and against our children, that, according to the sound of his *name* by its Greek interpretation, he may show himself a *maker of strife* (νεικῶν ποιητής).

This letter we have ordered to be written privately to serve as a brief information, for a perpetual memorial, with a view to future complaints, that no one may suspect us hereafter of having acted unjustly by Nicon, but may know that rather we have dealt very mildly with him, and have entered upon the royal road [*i. e.* have begun to use our imperial power according to our duty] not hastily, but so far from it that some, not knowing our secrets, have been scandalised, and have thought

that we were so patient as shrinking from trouble, and not caring enough about this ecclesiastical matter. However, at first the danger of other consequences, which were many, seemed to be less; or rather it seemed to be a greater good that he should appear free from [public charge of] guilt who now appears to be very guilty, than that we should act in any vehement or hasty manner. For we know that popular saying: '*Dura longanimiter; festina lente; attende tibi*' (Endure with meekness; be slow to haste; attend to thyself). But enough of these things for the present; farther details being reserved to be communicated to the bishops who shall be sent as thy representatives, whom we wish to see arrive as soon as possible, for the giving of satisfaction to ourselves, and for the direction of the Church. Mayest thou enjoy health for many years, O most venerated father, both as to the inner and the outer man, for the benefit and assistance of all the christian community! and continue to pray to our beneficent God for us, who trust in thy prayers.
Written in our imperial palace in the year from the creation 7173, from the birth of Christ 1665, the — day of the month of —.

2. *Letter to the patriarch of Jerusalem Nectarius.*

Alexis Mich. by the mercy of God, &c. [as in the letter to the patriarch of C.P. above], to the most blessed and most highly-reputed patriarch of the holy city of Jerusalem and of all Palestine, the hospodin Kyr Nectarius, gives due reverence, and kisses his holy hands.

Not many days [*i.e.* no long time] ago the honoured letter of thy highly-reputed beatitude, written on the 20th of March, was received by us with great joy, as imparting to us a blessing from the holy sepulchre, and being a running source of benediction; which letter treated of the affair of Nicon, long ago patriarch, of pacification, and of quiet, and of the settlement of the Church, than which there is nothing in this life more desired by us. However, that warm entreaty of thy beatitude came *much too late*. It came *after the writing of that tome*, confirmed by the hands of *you* the four most holy patriarchs, *which removed him* (alienavit) *from the patriarchal chair*, in both the copies of it alike.

Moreover, thy most judicious beatitude, *without the partici-*

pation of the rest of the patriarchs, made the sum of the matter to be this, that he should be invited back. But on the other hand it is a saying that 'the common judgment of all has the greater force,' while the vote of *one* added [separately] is held to be of little value. *That* observation too of *thine* we received as a sacred truth, and *will act upon it*, that in a just judgment a *single* testimony is never to be admitted, especially if the witness be of the *lowest* rank [the patriarch of Jerusalem ranking lowest of the four œcumenical patriarchs]: for in all things *order is to be kept*; and especially in the ecclesiastical firmament a certain likeness is to be preserved to the highest incorporeal constitutions, which are divided figuratively into nine orders.

On this account thou didst presume that any abdication would be invalid, if it be not confirmed and accepted by the superior authorities, adducing as a witness for this the most judicious patriarch Gennadius, who, in time past, wrote to this effect in one of his epistles concerning the validity of a resignation. And let this be granted by hypothesis to be so. But this abdication of Nicon *has been accepted* already by the regular synod; and it is [an abdication] subscribed with his hand, as may be seen in his own [not really *act of*, but *proposals for*] resignation, in which this also appears under one head, 'that he has [*shall* have] for the future nothing to do with the patriarchate.' On this account that abdication of his is a perfect abdication, because *it was accepted*. And therefore there can be no passing of it over [or excusing of it].

But suppose that we were ready to attend to the request of thy beatitude, which we respect exceedingly even as the words of a prophet, when thou sayest, 'On this account thy imperial majesty should call him back,'—what if we call him not, but he comes of his own will, *uncalled?* he will not certainly be guiltless. But that he did come, and how he came, hear, I beseech thee, O most blessed father. In the middle of the night, on the Sunday of the Holy Fathers, he came from his own new-created Jerusalem to our imperial precinct [the Kremlin] in pomp with lights. And it was so that there appeared at that time a comet, perhaps portending his violent advent. On account of this the whole city was agitated, and all the synclete were in consternation at this strange occurrence, and many went *audaciously* to him. What were we to do; or what counsel to

follow? In such difficulty and trouble were we placed. But Nicon meanwhile sat in the patriarchal chair boldly, surrounded by a multitude of the people. He received the obeisance of the metropolitan Jonah: the protopope took his orders: the deacon publicly named him as patriarch.

Is not all this a violent plot, a manifest defection, an unjust and violent aggression, seeking by a stratagem to take the patriarchal chair, when he was not called to it, *contrary to the canons*, by force and extortion, rejecting the ordinances of the saints, and trampling them under foot? Certainly this fresh act *exceeds* all his former acts in past time; that is, his arbitrary abdication, and his seven years' absence, his *seditious* intrigues and *secret envoys*, which out of respect we say no more of, *out of respect for the patriarchal* dignity.[67]

Having all this before your mind, and understanding how much more there is of a like nature [which has not been detailed], O most blessed father, give a *worthy* vote, holding the balance straight, *neither inclining it towards me nor towards him*, but cutting straight the furrow of *justice*.

I should have wished to see thee, and to speak privately with thy most judicious beatitude, as we have notified more at length in thy rest of our written communications. If this cannot be, then appoint another bishop instead of thyself to be thy representative, some one well learned and of good understanding. Do thus, and thou wilt very greatly benefit me, and wilt multiply many times *thy claim* for gratitude from us, who have a great veneration for the holy places, and *think of* paying their debts, by way of alms, *after this affair has been terminated*. May God, the giver of peace and the preserver of our life, be merciful, and give us what is profitable by thy fervent prayers; for the prayer of a righteous man that is fervent availeth much. Mayest thou continue for many years, most honoured father, for the common benefit and aid of us all! Written in our imperial palace, A.M. 7173 (A.D. 1664-1665).

Also thy goodness makes complaints, *and with truth*, of this, that letters are not accurately translated by the Greeks who

[67] A respect which is shown by intercepting and suppressing letters really written by patriarchs to one another, and by obtaining or forging and using such letters as that given above from Solovieff, as written by the patriarch of C.P. against Athanasius of Iconium and in favour of Paisius Ligarides.

are sojourning here, but more or less is added or taken away. And of this we have given command to make inquiry. However, for the documents brought from thee by Sebastus, they were written not only in Greek but also in Slavonic, so that no translator at all was used, through thy prudently-provided translation: and some things thy archdeacon Dositheus communicated to us in Latin, so that we made no use whatever of any Greek translators, having Latin translators with us in abundance. Nevertheless, as we have before said, we have given order to make inquiry about this, according to the wish of thy beatitude.

3. The *third* letter is written to engage the ex-patriarch of C.P. Parthenius to come hither to Moscow.

4. And the *fourth* letter is to the metropolitan of Adrianople Neophytus, that he should concert matters with the ex-patriarch of C.P., so that he too should come hither in company with him. Neither of these add anything noticeable.

XI.

In connection with the notices given by Paisius at pp. 85, 92, 94, there is here to be inserted a letter of Nicon, sent in Greek from Voskresensk to the patriarch Dionysius of Constantinople, but *intercepted* (in Jan. 1666) by the tsar, and afterwards produced by the tsar as evidence against Nicon before the council at Moscow, and actually made by that council in no small degree the ground of his condemnation.

'This letter was translated and written in Greek by a Greek named Demetrius, who was living at Voskresensk with the most holy Nicon: but at the time of the council he was taken and put into the prisons by the river side (*naberejnia palati*), where, from fear of the tsar, he killed himself with a knife.' Of the sending of this letter and of its interception, Solovieff writes as follows:

'Seeing that there was nothing to be done at Moscow, Nicon turned to the patriarchs, and wished to give them betimes accurate information about the affair, from his own point of view, and to justify his own conduct. But it was *difficult for him* to send letters to the patriarchs. An opportunity offered when, in 1665, 11th Sept., there came to Moscow the hetman of the Zaporog Kozaks, Ivan Martin. Briuchovetsky. There was then

living with Nicon in the Voskresensky monastery, among his gentlemen (*dieti-boyarskie*), a nephew of his own in the second degree (whose mother was Nicon's first cousin), a bourgeois of Kourmish, named Theodotus Timotheëff Marisoff. This Marisoff the patriarch sent to Briuchovetsky with a request that he would take him with him to Little Russia, and thence pass him on to Constantinople. But the hetman *refused*. Then an underling clerk about the patriarch, John *Dung* ['*Shushera*,' the real name being Shusherin, answering to the Latin name Stercorius], the author of a well-known life of Nicon, *bribed* a Kozak, Cyril Davidovich from Vasilkov, who took with him Marisoff, giving out that he was a nephew of his own who had been carried off into captivity at the time of the campaign of Boutourlin [and Khmielnitsky] against Lvoff [*i.e.* in A.D. 1655]. The affair was arranged for fifty rubles and fifty gold pieces. From Moscow Marisoff got away successfully after the end of Dec. 1655: but soon they got information there of his having gone; and in Jan. 1666 a courier was sent to Briuchovetsky, desiring him to *seize* the *envoy of the patriarch*. In consequence Marisoff was seized, and sent to Moscow, with the letters found upon him. These letters [this letter] were read. In them Nicon detailed circumstantially to the patriarchs what had befallen him since the time when he first took the patriarchal chair.' And, after giving an abstract of the letter, the professor continues: 'This letter, more than all besides, incensed the tsar against Nicon. Though it be true that even before Nicon had not been sparing of *harsh* (or fierce) expressions respecting Alexis Michaelovich, still that was his own affair, a private (or family) matter, of which his own friends—only a few individuals—knew. But now Nicon had determined to *expose in black colours* the conduct of the tsar towards himself,[68] towards the Church, and all the people, before foreigners, and what is more, before people whose good opinion of his religiousness Alexis Michaelovich most highly valued. With the utmost agitation and annoyance he read this letter, as is evident from the remarks written upon it, on the margin, with

[68] While the most orthodox and most pious and most inoffensive tsar was not even whispering a word in the ear of anybody against the patriarch of Moscow, still less seeking to pack against him an 'œcumenical council,' and privily to suggest to it what was to be its judgment beforehand.

his own hand. Thus, for instance, at the place where Nicon says that 'the heavy imposts laid by the tsar on the people bring no advantage,' Alexis Michaelovich has written: 'But he has *exemption* [from these imposts], and what advantage does *that* bring?' (vol. xi. p. 352-354.)

The Letter.

To the most blessed and most holy archbishop of New Rome and œcumenical patriarch Kyr Kyr Dionysius, in the Holy Ghost our beloved and highest brother, and father, and fellow-minister. I salute thy beatitude, praying God, who orders all our affairs for good, to keep thee from harm outwardly and inwardly, and from all power of the enemy, and to give thee continually from on high grace and strength to guide the rational flock committed to thee of God in his holy will. I hope that thou mayest be found[69] in health and prosperity and in all happiness, both of soul and body, by this our present letter, which is written to make known to your beatitude certain matters relating to ourselves; both how at the first I came to be made patriarch, and how afterwards I came to withdraw from the capital city of Moscow to the hermitage of Voskresensk, and all things that have occurred concerning us.

I was before metropolitan of Great Novgorod, the first metropolitan see in Great Russia, when it pleased God to take to himself the most holy Joseph, patriarch of Moscow and all Russia. After his decease, on my arrival at Moscow—for I had been sent by the tsar's council, with the blessing of our father of blessed memory the most holy[70a] patriarch Joseph, to the Solovetsky monastery for the relics of the holy martyr Philip, sometime metropolitan of Moscow and all Russia, whom the tsar John IV. Basilievich persecuted[b] unrighteously for his righteousness, the particulars of which for brevity I omit to relate. After some days there were words spoken on the part of the most religious tsar and grand prince Alexis Michaelovich,

[69] Dionysius, however, was deposed before the end of A.D. 1665, so that this letter, if it had not been intercepted by the pious tsar, would have found Parthenius IV. (who had sat before from 1657 to 1660, and whom Nicon seemingly supposed to be the sitting patriarch in Nov. 1666) in the chair at C.P.

[70] The small letters *a*, *b*, *c*, &c. in this letter of Nicon correspond to the same letters attached to observations made in the council, according to Solovieff's account of the reading of the letter, which will be given farther on.

autocrat of all Russia, and on the part of all the council, and on the part of the metropolitans and archbishops and all the people, for electing to the patriarchate of Moscow a patriarch, whom it should please God. And there was mention made, as from one mouth, from the tsar and his honourable council and all the sacred synod and all the people of our humility, that our unworthiness should be patriarch of Moscow and all Russia. And that was known to us: and on this account we were unwilling to go to the council. And when we were called for by the tsar's majesty, and by his imperial council, by the boyars, and the holy order of the clergy, not once nor twice, but many times, and we were unwilling to go, then at length the religious tsar sent some of his honourable boyars, and some of the metropolitans and archbishops and holy archimandrites and hegoumens and protopopes and other honourable people, to bring me from my house, against my will, to the synod by constraint. And when they had come to the holy catholic church (the cathedral), because there it was that the synod was being held by the most religious tsar, and the boyars, and the sacred order, and all the people, they set me in the midst before the tsar and all the people. And the most religious tsar, with all the assembly and synod, besought me much to be patriarch of Moscow and all Russia. And when I had for a long time refused, as not being of such capacity as to be fit to be alone the chief-pastor, saying that I am a humble person, and of no great parts, and cannot teach the flock of Christ's rational sheep, and much time had now passed—the Lord God is my witness that this is the truth—the tsar prostrated himself on the ground, and so lay with all the people, and with many tears besought me that I would become their chief pastor. And I was not able to disregard the tsar's entreaty. I remembered how it is written that the heart of the king is in the hand of the Lord: and I wept myself not a little; and I caused the tsar to rise up, and began to speak to the most religious tsar, and to all the synod, and to all the people, in words such as these:

'Most religious tsar and grand prince Alexis Michaelovich, autocrat of all Russia, and all ye religious boyars, and all ye members of the sacred synod, metropolitans, and archbishops, and bishops, and ye christian people! Ye are not ignorant how at the first there came into these countries the preaching of the

holy gospel and of the canons of the holy apostles and of the holy fathers, of the seven general and the nine local councils, and of the other individual holy fathers, and of the imperial laws; namely, how we received them from the religious Greek emperors and from the œcumenical patriarchs, as is attested by history. And we are called Christians, and followers of the divine precepts of the gospels and of the canons of the holy apostles and holy fathers, and of the laws of the religious Greek emperors: but as for the practice and reality of works, they are very poorly wrought among us; though our Lord Jesus Christ says: Why call ye me Lord, Lord, and do not the things that I say? And again elsewhere he said: He who hath my commandments and keepeth them, he it is that loveth me: and, He who loveth me not keepeth not my words. And again: If any one heareth my words and believeth them not, I judge him not, for I am not come to condemn the world, but to save the world: he who rejecteth me and receiveth not my words hath one that judgeth him: the word that I have spoken, that shall judge him in the last day. And again elsewhere he says: Not the hearers of the word are just before God, but the doers of it; for blessed are they that hear the word of God and keep it.

'And therefore, O most religious tsar, and ye the boyars, and all ye sacred synod, and all ye christian people, if it be agreeable to you that our humility should be your patriarch, then do ye give me your word, and make a covenant with me in this holy catholic and apostolic church, before the Lord God and our Saviour Jesus Christ, and before his holy gospels, and before the holy Mother of God, and the holy angels, and all the saints, and promise to keep the commandments of Christ's holy gospels, and the canons of the holy apostles and the holy fathers, and the laws of the religious Greek emperors, unchangeably, and to obey us as your chief pastor and supreme father in all things which I shall announce to you out of the divine commandments and laws: and if you will do this, then I, seeing your zeal and your demand, can no longer refuse this great chair.'

Thereupon the most religious tsar, with all the honourable boyars and with all the sacred synod, earnestly and affectionately catching up our answer, did then in the holy catholic and apostolic church, before the holy gospel, and before the holy venerable icons of Christ and the Mother of God, and of the

other saints, promise to keep unchangeably all that we had mentioned, and they called to witness our Lord and God Jesus Christ, and our most holy, immaculate, and most blessed and glorious Lady the Mother of God and ever-virgin Mary, and the holy angels, and all the saints, and the sacred and holy gospel, and all the holy and venerable icons. And after that, thereupon, all was performed that concerned our becoming patriarch, according to the accustomed order.

And at first the most religious tsar was exceedingly pious and gracious, and in all the divine law obedient to whatever we said, so far as was proper towards us: and by God's grace, and with our blessing, he *warred successfully* with Lithuania. Then he began by degrees *to be lifted up*, and to despise what we said out of the commandments of God, and to invade[e] matters belonging to the bishops, both by [is ing] orders and by [exercising] jurisdiction touching matters of divine grace; whether it were that of himself he chose so to act, or that he was perverted by evil men, like Rehoboam king of Israel, who rejected the counsel of the elders.

Then, after a time, there came to our most religious tsar Alexis Michaelovich, autocrat of all Great, Little, and White Russia, a certain tsar of Georgia named Teymouraz; and the tsar's majesty received him in the capital city of Moscow with gladness: and on the 4th day of July our most noble tsar made a great feast for the entertainment of the tsar Teymouraz, and invited him to the banquet: and then an okolnik of the tsar's majesty, named Bogdan Matveëvich Khitroff, was clearing the way for the meeting of the tsar, as he was expecting the tsar Teymouraz: and it chanced that there was there a man of ours, by name the prince Demetrius, according to the laws of the Church holding the office of defensor (ἔκδικος). And the okolnik of the tsar's majesty Bogdan Matveëvich struck him on the head with his staff a sharp blow. And when the man thus causelessly struck said to him, Bogdan Matveëvich: 'We are not come here idly, but on duty!' the okolnik of the tsar's majesty asked him: 'Who art thou?' and he said: 'I am the patriarch's man, and am appointed for such and such a duty.' And the okolnik of the tsar's majesty said to him: 'Don't make too much of thyself!' and struck him again with the same staff on the forehead, and wounded him very seriously: and he came

and showed me his wounds, complaining of the okolnik of the tsar's majesty, that is, of Bogdan Matveëvich Khitroff. And I wrote to the tsar's majesty with my own hand, requesting that he would do justice, and give redress against him who had struck our officer without cause: 'But' (I wrote) 'if thou wilt not judicially punish him who has unjustly struck our officer, then we, by the power given us from the Lord God, will punish him as we know how to do in order to justice.' And the tsar's majesty wrote to us with his own hand, that 'after a while I shall see thee.' And on that day he did not see us. And on the 8th of July it was the custom instituted by the tsars and bishops in time past to keep a festival in honour of the Icon of our Lady of Kazan, which has a church of its own at a certain spot; and in that church every year the tsar assists at the vespers and at the matins with all his synclete, and the patriarch with all the sacred synod; and they celebrate the holy liturgy, and the patriarch himself, assisted by the other bishops, pontificates. And when the time comes that they should assemble for the singing of the vespers, and when the patriarch goes to that church for the vespers, he then sends to give notice to the religious tsar one of the priests, to let him know that the patriarch is setting out to go to that church, that the tsar may come. But on this occasion the tsar would not go. Neither would he go to the matins: nor to the παράκλησις [and liturgy], having taken offence against me. And again on the 10th of the same month it was the custom instituted by former tsars, and by the great catholic and apostolic church of the Assumption of the holy Mother of God, to keep a festival in honour of the holy Tunic of our Lord God and Saviour Jesus Christ, which was brought from Persia; and the most religious tsar with all his synclete usually meet to attend the vespers and the matins; and, as in the former case, one of the priests is sent to the most religious tsar to invite him to come to the vespers. But on this occasion he would not come; but he sent a stolnik, whose father was a member of the synclete, the prince Youry Romodanofsky by name, to let me know that the tsar's majesty was wroth against me, and that on that account he would not be at the matins, and did not desire that I should wait for him at the liturgy. And he, the prince Youry, said to me in the tsar's name: 'Thou despisest and insultest the

tsar's majesty; and thou hast caused thyself to be styled Great Hossoudar. But thou art not a great tsar. We have only one hossoudar, the tsar.' And I to that replied, that for me to be styled Great Hossoudar was from no desire of my own, but the great hossoudar the tsar had been pleased so to style me both by word of mouth and in writing; and of this I have proof in the letters written to me by the tsar's majesty with his own hand. And he, the prince Youry, said: 'The tsar's majesty honoured thee as a father and pastor, and thou didst not know thyself (didst not know thy place): and now the tsar's majesty has commanded me to say to thee, that he forbids thee to style thyself in speaking and writing Great Hossoudar, and that he does not mean to honour thee any more.'

And seeing the tsar's wrath, that same day, after the celebration of the divine liturgy, calling to witness the Lord God and our Saviour Jesus Christ, and the most holy Mother of God, and the holy angels, and all the saints, and the holy Church, and all the sacred things, before a great concourse of the people, and before heaven and earth, we declared the tsar's wrath, saying that the tsar is wrath against me without just cause,[d] and on that account abstains from coming to the general assembly. And having written with my own hand a letter to the tsar's majesty, I sent it by a deacon, letting him know that on account of his anger I was going out of the city, according to that which is written, 'Give place to wrath:' and again, 'When they drive you out from this city, flee into another:' and, 'Wheresoever they will not receive you, nor obey your words, when ye depart out of that house or that city, shake off the dust from your feet.'

And the tsar's majesty, having read our letter, sent back together with that deacon, on the part of his imperial majesty, the boyar prince Alexis Troubetskoy and the okolnik Rodion Streshneff, with certain others. And they, having come to the church, said to me: 'The tsar's majesty has sent us, and has given us command to say to thee from him, "Wherefore wilt thou go?"' And I made answer: 'I give place to the wrath of the tsar's majesty;[d] because, contrary to justice, the synclete of the tsar's majesty, the boyars, and all kinds of people do all manner of wrongs[e] to the ecclesiastical order, and the tsar's majesty does not grant any investigation or satisfaction; but when we complain of such things, he is wroth against us. There is nothing

more terrible than for any man to incur the tsar's wrath, as Gregory the Divine writes in his discourse to the CL. Bishops.' The same boyars also said, taunting us and reviling us before a multitude of people: 'Thou hast given thyself the title of Great Hossoudar; and thou interferest in many affairs of the state: but for the future thou wilt please not to style thyself Great Hossoudar, nor to interfere in affairs of state.'

And we replied: 'We did not of ourselves take the title of Great Hossoudar; nor have we interfered in affairs of state. But for that we spoke to any one against injustice, and delivered the poor from their distresses, we bishops are appointed expressly for this: and this is a general commandment addressed to all from our Lord God and Saviour Jesus Christ, who has said: "He that heareth you heareth me, and he that rejecteth you rejecteth me."'

And after these things I put on the humblest and worst episcopal dress [that I could find], and went out from the cathedral to the town lodge of the Voskresensky monastery of our foundation, taking nothing of my personal property with me, but carrying only my personal quality, and taking a single mitre and other episcopal vestments, one of each, and those not rich, that I might be able to officiate as a bishop (but I did not go away as if renouncing the episcopal office, as now they calumniously assert, saying that I of my own self renounced the episcopate); and there I waited, expecting till the tsar's majesty should be pacified, [and letting him know] that I wished to go out to the monastery which I was founding at Voskresensk. And the tsar's majesty sent again the same boyars to desire that I should not go out [from the city] without having first seen him. And I, after waiting there three days, expecting some message from the tsar's majesty, when none came, after those three days went out to the monastery which I was founding at Voskresensk.

Again there were sent to me there some of those same boyars, saying: 'Wherefore hast thou, without order from the tsar's majesty, gone away from Moscow?' And I answered them: 'I have not gone away to any great distance; if the tsar's majesty should change so as to become gracious, and lay aside his wrath, I will come back again.' And after that there was no communication ever made on that subject from the tsar's majesty, nor

mention of my return, that I should return to my chair; but there was an order made that the metropolitan of Kroutitz Pitirim should administer [the patriarchate] for the time. And after our departure the tsar's majesty forbade people of all orders to approach me, or to listen to me. He also forbade that which I wanted to be given to me from the patriarchal residences. And whoever comes to us, if information of that reaches the tsar's majesty, they examine such persons with severity, and send them into exile to distant places. And so he has struck terror upon all people. And the tsar's majesty has ordered that the whole patriarchate, in respect of all matters pertaining to it, be administered by the metropolitan of Kroutitz, and he has forbidden that we should be asked or applied to, and has ordered that he himself be applied to absolutely in all episcopal and spiritual matters.

Moreover, with the same great hossoudar there has been established a court called the monastirski prikaz; and under the tsar's majesty that court has order to give judgment upon patriarchs, and upon metropolitans, and archbishops, and on the whole sacred order. And there are set in it to judge lay people, but of the spiritual order no one. In it they judge under the tsar's majesty of all that relates to the property of the Church, movable and immovable. And this is enacted in the book of the Code,[f] which book (made in his reign) is in complete opposition with the holy divine gospels, with the constitutions and canons of the holy fathers, and with the imperial laws of the Greek emperors: and now they judge, and make decrees (and pass sentences), according to it, and set it up above Christ's gospel. But in the beginning of that book there is written:

'In the year of the world 7156 (A.D. 1648), on the 17th day of July, the tsar and grand prince Alexis Mich. autocrat of all Russia, in the twentieth year of his age, and the third of his divinely-protected reign, took counsel with his father and beadsman, the most holy Joseph patriarch of Moscow and all Russia, and with the metropolitans, and archbishops, and bishops, and with all the synod of the clergy, and spake with his imperial boyars, and with his okolniks, and the people of his council, proposing that those heads in the canons of the holy apostles and the holy fathers, and [in the civil laws] of the Greek emperors, which are applicable to the general and particular government

of the state, should be written out; and that the ukazes of the former great hossoudars the tsars and grand princes of Russia, and of his father the great hossoudar the tsar and grand prince Michael Theodorovich, &c. of blessed memory, and the orders and decisions (*prigovori*) of the boyars, should be collected and compared with the old statute-books; and that for whatever heads there seem to be no ukazes of former sovereigns, or decisions of the boyars in the former statute-books, these heads should be formulated likewise, and set forth by his imperial ukaz, by common counsel, in order that the people of the Muscovite empire, of all ranks, from the highest to the lowest, may have one uniform administration of justice criminal and civil, in all causes and for all alike. And the hossoudar the tsar and grand prince Alexis Mich. &c. made a decree that all that collation should be made and digested into a report by the boyars the prince Nikita Ivan. Odoefsky, and the prince Simeon Basil. Prozorofsky, and the okolnik the prince Theodore Theod. Volkonsky, and the secretaries Gabriel Leontieff and Theodore Griboyedeff.'

But as for the contents of that book itself, there is no single commandment of God written there, nor any one of the canons of the holy apostles, or of the fathers, or of the imperial laws, but what is contrary to all these, and fraudulently introduced, and entirely against the holy Church and the sacred order of the clergy.

In that book, ch. x. § 1, there is written: 'The judgment of the great hossoudar the tsar and grand prince Alexis Michaelovich of all Russia, &c., how the boyars, and okolniks, and officers of the council, and the secretaries, and all the officers and secretaries of the different prikazes, and all judges whatsoever, are to judge,' &c.; but not from the commandments of God, and the canons of the holy apostles and the holy fathers, nor from the imperial laws of the Greek emperors.

And in ch. xiii. § 1: 'Our sovereign lord the tsar and grand prince Alexis Mich. of all Russia, &c., on the petition of the stolniks, and the strapchis, and the sin-boyars, and the dvorianins of Moscow, and the dvorianins of the towns, and on that of the gosti, and of the centuries of the clothiers, and of the black centuries, of the people of the slobodas, and of the towns, and of the fortified places, has decreed that there be erected a

monastery court (monastirski prikaz), separately, and that [it shall have jurisdiction] over metropolitans, and archbishops, and bishops, and the people of their prikazes and dvors, and their sin-boyars, and all their other people and peasants; also over the monasteries, and archimandrites, and hegoumens, and stroitels, and economes, and kellars, and kaznacheys, and over all the common brethren, and over the servants of the monasteries, and over their peasants; and over popes, and over the church clerks (diaki), so that in all suits of plaintiff and defendant judgment shall be given in this monastery court.' And they that are set to judge in that court are lay people; and of the spiritual order there is not so much as one.

For the rest of the contents of that unrighteous book, it is not possible here to write them for their number. And of that accursed book we many times spoke to the tsar's majesty that he should annul it, and keep to the laws of God, the commandments of the holy gospel, and the canons of the holy apostles and the holy fathers, and the imperial laws of the old religious emperors; and that lay people should not judge the sacred order; and that the metropolitans and archbishops and bishops, archimandrites, and hegoumens, popes, and all the clerks of the Church, should not be judged by lay people, nor dragged by force before them for judgment.

And on this account—for all these things—hating us without just cause, not once nor twice only they even sought to kill me, because by God's help we enforce and hold in all things inseparably the traditions of *the Greek law*.

And on that same account I wrote to thy predecessor, the most blessed and most holy œcumenical patriarch Paisius, concerning the holy Creed, and concerning the other rules of the Church; and we received from him a tome of answers to all; and by that we go in all things, according to the order which the holy *Eastern* Church is used to follow. On this account we sent with much money to the holy city of Jerusalem and to the imperial city of C.P. and to the holy mountain of Athos, for ancient copies of holy books; and not fewer than 500 were obtained and brought to us, some of them written 1000, some 700, some 500 years ago; and what we from those divine books, by God's grace, have corrected and translated, that they call a new rule, and a tradition of Nicon's, that is, of mine.

And for all such evil counsels they have found—I know not whence—an ally (or tool) to help them, contrary to the commandments of God and of the holy apostles and the holy fathers, in a certain Paisius Ligarides, whom they have taken up, and whom they call metropolitan of Gaza: and this man is the deviser of their counsel against me to the tsar's majesty for all [manner of] evils: and we know not whether he be really a metropolitan.

Once I was slandered to the noble tsar, as if I had [publicly] cursed him, whereas I had never done [anything against him], except it were by my secret prayers [that is, for his correction or punishment]. And on that account there was sent to us, to the monastery of Voskresensk, one of the boyars of the tsar's majesty, the prince Nikita Odoefsky, with certain other colleagues and many officials, and together with them that metropolitan of Gaza Paisius Ligarides,[8] to sit in trial on me, and to make inquest if the charge were true. And when I asked him who and whence he was, and where was his see, and by whom he was consecrated bishop, and whether he had with him his letters of consecration to exhibit in proof, and whether he had letters to us from the most holy œcumenical patriarch, testifying that he was a true bishop, and wherefore he came to us contrary to the canons of the holy apostles and the fathers, he made us no sort of answer [to these questions], but only reviled us with all manner of unseemly abuse. And on this account I wrote to the tsar's majesty that it is not right to receive such persons without certificates, according to the divine commandment, which says: 'He that entereth not by the door into the sheepfold, but creepeth in by some other way, the same is a thief and a robber.' And again, elsewhere, it is said: 'There shall arise false prophets, and shall deceive many.' And it is forbidden by canons vii. xi. xiii. xxii. of the holy fathers of the synod of Antioch, by canon xli. of the holy synod of Laodicea, by canons v. xiii. xxiii. of the Fourth holy œcumenical council of Chalcedon, by canon iii. of the holy synod of Sardica, canons xxiii. and cvi. [xxvi. and cix. Bev.] of the holy synod of Carthage, and by canon xx. of the Sixth holy œcumenical council. And to what we wrote no attention was paid; but the tsar was inclined to follow him in all things; and whatever he uttered he received it as from the lips of God; and he listens to him as to a prophet

of God; a man of whom it is said by some who have known him that he is a Roman, and held the Roman faith; that he was ordained deacon and priest by the Pope's authority at Rome; and that when he was in Poland with the king he celebrated the mass in their kostels after the Roman fashion. And priests and deacons who have lived with him in Moscow say of him that he does nothing becoming the episcopate; that he eats flesh-meat and drinks without regard to times; and eats and drinks first when he is going to officiate [*i.e.* to celebrate the liturgy], and celebrates afterwards; and that he commits sodomy. And having written a letter containing [the assertions of] such witnesses, I sent it to the tsar's majesty, and it made no difference: but all those persons [who had so witnessed of Paisius] he banished to different places. An authentic testimony against the same man there is in a little book, a Commentary on the Magnificat, in which he has written: 'To my most intimate and specially-beloved the Lord Cardinal Francis . . . (after a style manifestly not apostolical) and my most honoured Lord Archbishop . . . Panteleëmon Ligarides of Scio; in the book of Neophytus of Rhodes.'

And when by the tsar's desire there are synods held, such as are held about us, they then make the metropolitan of Gaza president in them: and he is called the exarch [namiestnik, *i.e.* lit. τοποτηρητὴς, vicar or representative, commissioned] to deal with the case concerning us from all the œcumenical patriarchs.

And they sit in judgment on us behind our back, and seek and receive testimony from all manner of dishonest people. And whatever any one says [against me], they credit it: and on the ground of these fables they everywhere institute proceedings concerning us. And, more than this, by the tsar's order and consent, letters were sent to all the towns, to the monasteries, to inform against me when and from what monastery I may have taken anything of movable or immovable property, in lands, or gold, or dollars, and so on. But of all such things, by God's grace, I am pure.

And after one year from our retirement to the monastery of Voskresensk [after the disaster at Konotop in A.D. 1659], an alarm came upon the tsar and all the people at Moscow as if an irruption of the barbarians [the Tatars] was at hand. And the tsar's majesty sent to me his lord in waiting (blijnago) that

we might be informed of that; and we said to him: 'Except at Moscow we have no house to which we could go; and to go away to our distant monasteries we have not the means: so do thou report to the tsar, and ask where is it his pleasure that we should be.' And the same day from other informants we were told that the Tatars were coming upon Moscow. So we, without waiting till the Tatars should come up, drove to Moscow, and on arriving there alighted at our own lodge of the monastery of Voskresensk. And there came to us from the tsar's majesty the secretary of the council, Almiaz Ivanoff,[h] and questioned us thus: 'The tsar's majesty has commanded me to ask thee why thou hast come to Moscow?' And we said that we had come in consequence of a message which we had received from the tsar's majesty, and on account of the invasion of the barbarians. And after that for three days there was no manner of communication made to us: but after three days there came again from the tsar's majesty the secretary of the council, Almiaz, and said to us: 'The tsar's majesty has commanded thee to go to the Koliazin monastery: go, then, and do not be obstinate, lest greater wrath be provoked against thee.' And we said: 'If our coming is disagreeable to the tsar's majesty, and peace and our blessing are not to his mind, we will go back to our own foundation of the monastery at Voskresensk; but to the Koliazin monastery we will not go.' And so a second time I departed out of Moscow to the monastery of Voskresensk. And after that time I heard many times that the tsar's majesty is writing to your high-priesthood for a constitution declaring what you bid him to do with us; and that he wishes to obtain a decree to the effect that we never again hold our chair, and that you should assist them; and that he is already sending to you a large sum of money.[i] And we know not if this is true: but *whatever letters come from your high-priesthood*, the tsar *shows them to nobody;* and whatever persons bring letters from you, *they are kept under guard*, and are *not allowed to see anybody* till they return.

And in the year 1665 [1664], one week before the Nativity, a certain man of holy life, named Nikita,[k] who had before been by rank one of the tsar's boyars, but for the sake of justice has been utterly deprived of that rank, wrote to us as many as three times (and we know not whether really by the tsar's command,

or by the instigations of his friends, or of his own piety), wishing to bring about peace and amity between us. The tsar's majesty (so he wrote) sent to him certain persons of those about him, whom he regards favourably, and bade him write to us, the humble Nicon patriarch, that we should come to Moscow before the Nativity of Christ uncalled, of ourselves, and that the tsar's majesty would be glad of our coming, and would receive us with joy. So, having come to Moscow, I entered into the holy catholic and apostolic church [into the cathedral], and stood in my episcopal place, and sent to let the tsar's majesty know. And we, imitating the depth of the humility of God the Word, did all this that we then did. And when we were in the cathedral church we sent thence to the tsar's majesty Jonah the metropolitan of Rostoff, whom we found there, and the archimandrite of our monastery, and one priest of the cathedral, to announce to the tsar's majesty our having come. And the tsar's majesty was wroth with the metropolitan, and the archimandrite, and the priest, and sent them out from his presence with dishonour, and gave command to suspend them from performing divine service. And after that the tsar's majesty sent to us from his highest boyars the prince Nikita Odoefsky, with others his colleagues, and asked us: 'Why hast thou come?' And we said: 'To bring peace and blessing to the tsar's majesty, and to *you*, if ye are willing to receive us in the Lord.' And they went with that word to the tsar's majesty. And having come again from the tsar's majesty to the cathedral, and with them the metropolitan of Gaza and the metropolitan of Kroutitz, and other ecclesiastical dignitaries, they said to us: 'The tsar's majesty has commanded us to say to thee: Go back to the monastery of Voskresensk, and abide there till farther orders; and delay not, that nothing worse be the consequence: and wait for a decree from the œcumenical patriarchs: for they have been written to from the tsar's majesty to that end several times; and the tzar's majesty is expecting soon to receive a decree from them.' And we, on account of the precept of the gospel, were not inclined to have much more to do with them: for, 'where,' it is said, 'they will not receive you, nor hearken unto your words, when ye go out of that city shake off even the dust of your feet for a testimony to them.'

And so, taking the crozier[1] which stood at the episcopal

place, I went out with it: and as I went out of the city [*i. e.* of the kremlin] to depart, and at each of the gates [in the other walls] of the city, I shook off from my feet[m] the dust, repeating those words of the gospel: and I came to Chernevo, a village of ours, belonging to our monastery of Voskresensk, twenty versts distant from Moscow. And the tsar's majesty sent after us of those about his person the okolnik Rodion Streshneff and the secretary of the council Almiaz Ivanoff, and with them six men of the heads of the streltses with many soldiers, also the metropolitan of Kroutitz, with other ecclesiastical dignitaries. And they said to us: 'The tsar's majesty has commanded us to take from thee the crozier.' And I said to them: 'It is not right for the tsar's majesty to take from us the crozier by force: we did not receive it from him, but from the grace of the Holy Ghost, from above.' And on that account they straitened us much with famine, and with all manner of constraint. And after having endured much,[n] seeing that it was impossible to get away from them with that crozier in our hands, I said to them that were sent from the tsar's majesty: 'Before this your coming we called to witness God, heaven and earth, and the other holy things, and now we testify before this holy crozier that only let the tsar's majesty cease to be wroth with us, and then, if our humility is not agreeable to him, to be patriarch in Moscow, let him do as he pleases. Only let him be in charity again with us, and not afflict us. And whoever shall be patriarch in our room [let it be understood] that he also in like manner is not to wrong us, nor in any way interfere with our personal property [or foundations]. And if the tsar's majesty will only observe justice also towards us, then this crozier shall be to him for a blessing, and to avenge him of his adversaries. But if there shall be found any injustice on the part of the tsar's majesty towards our humble person, then this holy crozier shall be to the tsar's majesty for a witness against him, and for an exaction of vengeance for all his injustice.'

And after this I sent that crozier by the hand of our archimandrite to the tsar's majesty; and we ourselves, being then no longer detained by them, went on to the monastery of Voskresensk. And after that, when some short space had intervened, the tsar's majesty sent the secretary of the council Dementius Bashmakoff, and Joachim the archimandrite of the Choudoff

monastery, desiring that we should give the above words of ours in writing under our hand: and we did that also, according to his imperial command, and sent the writing to the tsar's majesty. And there was *no answer* made to us to that writing. But the good man who has been mentioned before, whose name was Nikita [Ziuzin], who was before a boyar, was by the tsar's wrath deprived of all his property, and banished to a distant place; and his wife, a pious woman, from fear of intolerable tortures, suddenly departed this life.[k] The subdeacon Nikita,[o] who had brought to us letters from him, being cast into prison and into fetters, soon died. The priest[o] Sisoi, who came to us with a letter, was banished, no one knows whither, with all his family. The *blessed* Athanasius, metropolitan of Iconium, who bore witness concerning the *fraudulent* letters against me which Meletius the deacon brought, and who also witnessed against the metropolitan of Gaza that he was an enemy of God and a son of perdition, was also banished into the Simonoff monastery. Theophanes, archimandrite of the monastery of Castamoneta on the holy mountain of Athos, was banished to the Cyrilloff monastery of Bielo-ozero, with his brethren. The econome of Voskresensk, the hieromonach Aaron,[o] was banished to Solovka. Basil, the protodiacon of the great church, with all his family was banished to Siberia. Sebastus Demetrieff, who brought letters from the most blessed patriarch of Jerusalem [Nectarius], was banished to the dungeon tower in the upper story of the tsar's palace. And many others whose names we know not: whoever speaks a good word[o] of us, or brings any letters or information, they are banished and tortured.[p] And over every sacred function he has set up his own imperial command. Not being willing to receive a blessing from our humility, nor waiting for any decree to be given in pursuance of his letters from you œcumenical high-priests, he directed by his own order [alone] that there should be held a certain synod [in A.D. 1661]: and over that synod he ordered that the metropolitan of Gaza, Paisius Ligarides, should be *president:* and at that synod, with the blessing of Paisius Ligarides, metropolitan of Gaza, they agreed to translate Pitirim the metropolitan of Kroutitz to Novgorod, the first metropolitan see of Russia, contrary to the divine canons, as your high-priesthood knows that it is forbidden for a bishop to change about from one see to another.[q] And they had scarcely so done

by that see, when in his room they appointed and consecrated Paul archimandrite of the Choudoff monastery to be metropolitan of Kroutitz: and other bishops in like manner they appointed for many other sees. And from that their lawless synod there ceased to be in Russia union with the holy Eastern Church, and with your blessing, but they took their initiative (or lead) instead from the Roman Kostel, to suit their own wills.[r]

But from the year 886 from the Incarnation, in the time of the most blessed patriarch of C.P., Photius, and of the emperor Basil the Macedonian, when the Russians received holy baptism from the holy Eastern Church, to these our own times, we Russians have had no sort of communion with the Western Kostel; but in all the most essential acts, as concerning the creation of the primates, and concerning the determination of other spiritual matters, we have ever taken the counsel and blessing of the holy Eastern Church from the most holy œcumenical patriarchs. Only one metropolitan of Russia, Isidore, who was at the council of Florence, united himself with the Roman Kostel: but after his union, when he came back from the council to Russia, we did not receive him as orthodox, but rejected him as a heretic.

But now here all is done according to the tsar's pleasure. When any one wishes to become a clerk, or deacon, or priest, or hegoumen, or archimandrite, they write a petition to the tsar's majesty that he will make order to some metropolitan or archbishop; and upon the tsar's order they write an ukaz[s] on those petitions, thus: 'The hossoudar the tsar has been pleased to order that the bearer N. be made deacon, or pope, or of any other order [as the case may be].' And so they ordain upon the tsar's order, not by grace of the Holy Ghost. And when a metropolitan or archbishop ordains any one, they write in their letters of ordination that such an one has been ordained deacon or priest by ukaz of the hossoudar the tsar, not according to the commandments of God and the canons of the holy apostles and the holy fathers. And when the tsar commands a synod to be held, they hold a synod: and whomsoever he commands them to elect and consecrate to any bishopric, they elect and consecrate him: and whom he commands them to judge, they judge, and condemn, and depose or degrade. And all the property and revenues of the patriarchal diocese the tsar

applies to his own outgoings: and when he commands, they apply them to improper purposes.[d] In like manner of the possessions and revenues also of the metropolitan and archiepiscopal and episcopal sees, and of the honourable and great monasteries, he gives orders to take both the people for service, and money and corn, and they take them, with no regard to justice,[t] as if in exaction of a debt. Likewise also they load all the christian people with heavy tributes and capitation taxes threefold; and these exactions *bring him no advantage.*

And on this account I many times wrote to the tsar's majesty, pointing out to him the examples of the former people of Israel, and of the Christian orthodox Greek emperors and their laws;—how this or that of them lived so as to please God, and what grace this or that of them obtained from God on account of their good works: in like manner also which of them lived unrighteously, and what punishment this or that one of them incurred from God for his evil deeds; and it was to no sort of purpose, but rather served to move him to wrath: and on this account the tsar's majesty often sent to us those who were about his person to forbid us to write to him, pointing out the examples of former emperors or tsars: 'And if,' they would say, 'thou dost not cease so to write, then'—abusing and reviling us, they would allude to former generations, and point out how this man or that of those that offended sovereigns suffered for it, and say that the tsar would no longer endure it.

Also a boyar of the tsar's majesty, Simeon Lucian. Streshneff, taught a dog[w] which he had to sit up; and as at his ascension our Lord Jesus Christ lifted up his hands and blessed his disciples, so he taught that dog also with both his fore-paws lifted up to mimic the divine blessing; and they call that dog 'the patriarch.' And we, having heard of that lawless impiety and audacity, anathematised him, and cut him off from Christianity: but the tsar's majesty commanded that no account should be taken of that [excommunication], and kept him still with him in honour as before.

In like manner also we anathematised Pitirim the metropolitan of Kroutitz, because after our departure he ceased in the holy services of the church to name us (and such priests as named us in the church services they tortured with divers tortures, and banished them to distant places). And our orders—whatever it

might be that we ordered—he would not at all obey, but began to obey only the tsar's majesty: and whatever he commanded him, though not according to the commandments of God, nor according to the canons of the holy apostles and holy fathers, that he did. So he consecrated [5 May 1661] a bishop, Methodius, by the titles of Orsha and Mstislaff: but those places were in Lithuania, and the tsar's majesty had not at the time possession of them. And having consecrated him he sent him into the metropolitan see of Kieff; and they called him '*Guardian*' of that see. But the metropolitan see of Kieff was indeed originally one with that of Moscow, by the blessing of the most holy œcumenical patriarch of Constantinople; but there are now [more than] 200 years since it separated itself and was separately under the blessing of the œcumenical patriarch of C.P. And when we were at Moscow, and the tsar's majesty many times spake to us that we should consecrate a metropolitan for Kieff, we always refused without your blessing and counsel to do that.[71] But that metropolitan of Kroutitz, Pitirim, did it without your blessing. And the same Pitirim in the holy divine services, and in the λιτεῖαι, stood and sat in those places and seats in which our brethren the former patriarchs and we used to stand and to sit. But the patriarchs of Constantinople and of Antioch and of Jerusalem, who came here, when we wished to honour them according to their precedence in the holy divine services, so that they should sit above us, and take the first part in the divine service, declined, and said to us that it is not proper so to do. And we admonished the tsar's majesty of that, that the metropolitan of Kroutitz should not do any such thing, and that he should not order or permit it: but that admonition was not attended to. And the same Pitirim, by ukaz of the tsar's majesty, assembled repeatedly synods concerning us, and bore false witness concerning us, that we, departing from Moscow, vowed with an oath that we would be no more patriarch. But we, when we went forth, anathematised him, whosoever he should be, other than ourselves, who should become patriarch after us so long as we should be still living. And as respects a trial, what is the way in which a patriarch ought to be tried and judged, by how many patriarchs and metropolitans and bishops, your high-priesthood is not ignorant. Not even a metropolitan can lawfully

[71] See *Replies*, &c. p. 158.

be judged according to the canons [and the civil laws] without the patriarch: how much less, then, is it lawful to judge a patriarch without a synod of the most holy œcumenical patriarchs? And as touching this matter, we pray your holiness to judge of us and of the tsar's majesty with justice, how it ought to be, as ye also shall yourselves be judged at the day of the second coming of our Lord God and Saviour Jesus Christ; and speak to us about all with justice. And we ourselves also [so far as our own person is concerned] are not earnest about this [*i.e.* for justice], in order that we may be again patriarch at Moscow, but only that we may not incur the danger of acting against the will of God.

But if there should be in this matter any unjust decree on your part, our Lord Jesus Christ will require that of you[x] in the day of judgment according to justice. Farewell.

Written at the monastery of the New Jerusalem of our founding, at Voskresensk (*i.e.* the monastery of the Resurrection), in the year 7174 (A.D. 1665-1666).

XII.

At p. 106-110, and p. 197-199, 'Of certain new Russian Schismatics.' For an account of the origin of this schism, and of Nicon's correction of the church books, see that extract from the work of Macarius (then vicar-bishop of Vinnitsa, and rector of the Spiritual Academy at St. Petersburg) which has been subjoined as an appendix to the Travels of Macarius patriarch of Antioch.

XIII.

At p. 159. 'Nicon . . . having fallen into a reprobate mind, made bold to change the old customs of Constantinople, and Alexandria, and Antioch, and Jerusalem, and even those of the former patriarchs of Moscow, not only by wearing *red stripes* on his mandya instead of blue,' &c. And compare p. 79, where Nicon is represented as having asked Ligarides why *he* too wore a red-striped mandya. It is a small matter: but since those red stripes connect Nicon by certain personal relations with the patriarchs of Jerusalem, one of whom had consecrated him to the see of Novgorod, and since they are explained by Ligarides to symbolise union with Christ's blood-shedding and resurrection, they shall be noticed here. In like manner, as has elsewhere

been related, the patriarch Macarius of Antioch in 1655 gave to Nicon a crozier, as if he were the chief successor of St. Peter, who conferred by such a gift, or recognised at least (if it had been conferred already), in the receiver a share of St. Peter's supreme pastoral authority.

Letter of Paisius patriarch of Jerusalem, by which he certifies that he has ordained Nicon to be metropolitan of Novgorod, and confers on him the right to wear a mandya with red stripes.

'Paisius, &c.: When any shepherd of the sheep from age or disease has become incapable of feeding the flock, there is need that another be put in his stead to feed the same rational sheep, and to drive away the wolves with the triple-plaited sling, that the sheep may not be destroyed and scattered. . . . And whereas the *late* metropolitan of Novgorod Kyr Aphthonius, not being able, from his very advanced age and his many ailments, any longer to feed his flock, had voluntarily resigned, and we in the mean time, in these days, happened to be at Moscow, having come from Jerusalem to do obeisance to *our* most religious and most powerful and divinely-crowned emperor and grand prince Kyr Kyr Alexis Michaelovich, autocrat of all Russia, the son beloved in the Holy Ghost of our mediocrity, we have elected [*i. e.* have joined in electing] to be metropolitan of Novgorod a most pious hieromonach, the archimandrite of the imperial monastery of our Saviour, Nicon by name, and have raised him to the chair of the most holy metropole of Novgorod. And we also, seeing his great virtue and worth, and not having any other grace to show him, have given him the right of wearing his mandya *with red stripes*, and have blessed him to wear it so *all his life*; and no one is to raise any question against him for doing so. And for confirmation and security we have given this our patriarchal letter to the said metropolitan of Novgorod Kyr Nicon, the beloved brother and fellow-minister of our mediocrity. Written in the capital city of Moscow, in the lodge (μετόχι) of St. Cyril, May 5th, A.M. 7157 (A.D. 1649), Indict. 2 [written on a common sheet of paper, and subscribed in autograph by the patriarch with his signature or cipher]. Paisius, by the mercy of God patriarch of the holy city of Jerusalem.' (*Roumantseff's Collection*, &c. vol. iii. p. 447. No. 135.) Paisius Ligarides, at p. 161, manifestly supposes that Nicon had been

consecrated to the metropolitan chair of Novgorod by the patriarch Joseph of Moscow.

XIV.

At p. 113-130. (Letters sent to the two patriarchs on their approach, and Addresses made to them on their arrival at Moscow.) Here we insert from roll (stolbetz) vii. of the patriarchal or synodal archives at Moscow some additional documents.

I. [From the synod, 11 March 1666] To the great hospodin, our brother in the Holy Ghost, the most reverend Joseph archbishop of Astrachan and Terek, we, the brethren in the same Holy Ghost of thy prelacy, Pitirim metropolitan of Novgorod, Laurentius of Kazan, Jonah of Rostoff, Paul of Sarai and Podonsk, Simon archbishop of Vologda, Philaret of Smolensk, Hilarion of Riazan, Joasaph of Tver, Arsenius of Pskoff, and Alexander bishop of Viatka and Great Perm, greeting: In this year 7174 (A.D. 1666) it has been made known to us that there are coming to our great hossoudar the tsar &c. to Moscow the pope and patriarch of Alexandria Kyr Paisius, and the patriarch of Antioch Kyr Macarius, and the archbishop of Mount Sinai Kyr Acacius, and from the province of the patriarch of C.P. the metropolitan of Trebizond; and their way will be by Astrachan. And when it shall please God that the most holy œcumenical patriarchs come to Astrachan, thou our brother must show them all suitable honour with all attention, that they be received and sent on, &c. And *if they begin to ask thee for what matters they are bidden to Moscow, thou shalt say to them that* Astrachan is very distant from Moscow, and that on this account *thou knowest not* for what matters they may be bidden to Moscow; but thou supposest that they are bidden *in consequence of the ex-patriarch Nicon having vacated the patriarchate,* and for other grave ecclesiastical matters. And if thou shouldest have farther any little conversation with them, thou our brother must speak as if thou hadst heard from some other source any matter which thou mentionest, and not as if thou hadst personal knowledge of it. But that thou our brother wert with [that is, wert sent as commissioner to] the patriarch Nicon with the tsar's boyar the prince Nikita Ivan. Odoëfsky, *this thou must not tell them.* And in all respects thou must be cautious and reserved: and thou must also bid the clergy and the lay people who shall be with

thee to say nothing about that matter to the most holy œcumenical patriarchs and the people who may be with them, but to be guarded in all respects. And when they shall be come to Moscow, and shall see the tsar, then information will be given to them, the œcumenical patriarchs, respecting the departure of the patriarch Nicon from the chair, and *respecting all that the synod has done.*[72]

[In a written draft joined with the foregoing all is exactly the same as above except the following: 'But about the departure of the patriarch Nicon from the chair, and that thou our brother wert with,' *i. e.* wert sent to, 'him the patriarch, thou shalt say nothing to the œcumenical patriarchs; and thou shalt enjoin on the archimandrites and hegoumens that they also say nothing; to the end that they, the œcumenical patriarchs, may know nothing about these matters till such time as they be come to Moscow. And if the patriarchs should ask thee about the departure of the patriarch Nicon from the chair, thou shalt answer them that at the time when the patriarch Nicon left his chair and went away thou wert not in Moscow, and on account of the great distance of Astrachan from Moscow thou knowest not exactly how it was. But when it pleases God that they be come to Moscow,' &c. as above.] 'Such a letter was issued to the under-secretary for secret service, March 11' (1666).

II. Besides the letters of the tsar given in *Paisius' History*, p. 113-116, dated 14 Sept., and sent by Peter Khitroff, there are in the synodal archives, roll vii., the following minute, and report, together with the copies or drafts of two letters sent from the synod of the clergy through the prikaz of secret service:

III. A.M. 7175 (A.D. 1666) Sept. 23, by ukaz of the tsar &c. and by the blessing of the most reverend the metropolitans, archbishops, and bishops, Paul archimandrite of the Spass-Euthymieff monastery of Souzdal, with the hieromonachs Job and Ignatius of the same monastery, were sent to meet the patriarchs.

From Moscow by ukaz, &c. I the archimandrite Paul was

[72] On the other side of the roll (*stolbetz*) containing this document there is superscribed as follows: 'To the great hospodin our brother,' &c. down to 'as if thou hadst heard from some one else:' then 'The humble Pitirim, by the mercy of God metropolitan, &c. has subscribed with his own hand. The humble Simon, archbishop of Vologda, &c. The humble Alexander, bishop: Bartholomew has set his hand. The hieromonach Sergius Soltikoff:' as if some clerk had been amusing himself with thus writing.

ordered to go by the Moskva to Kalomna, and thence by the Oka to Riazan, and thence to Mourom, and thence to Nijny, and thence to such place as it might happen to me, to meet the œcumenical patriarchs. And I by the will of God went by water to Mourom, Oct. 9; and at Mourom I learned that the patriarchs were travelling by land from Simbirsk. And I the archimandrite Paul, with the hieromonachs &c., went by land from Mourom to Arzamas; and Oct. 11, in the forest of Arzamas, before reaching Arzamas, at a distance of forty poprischc, I met the most holy patriarchs, and gave order to announce to them my arrival; that by ukaz of the tsar &c. I had come to meet them, and had brought letters from all the sacred synod. And the most holy patriarchs alighted from their carriages with all their dignitaries, and Theognost metropolitan of Trebizond, and Anastasius archbishop of Mount Sinai. And I by ukaz of the tsar &c. and by the blessing of the sacred synod, according to the minute of instructions given me, said:

'Great hospodin, Paisius, &c. The beadsmen of our religious tsar &c. the most reverend metropolitans, archbishops, and bishops &c., and all the sacred synod, ask of thee thy blessing, and make their obeisance and petition.' An obeisance. 'They wish to be informed of your health and of your journey,' &c. An obeisance. And I delivered to him the letter. An obeisance. Then again I said [having recited again the tsar's full title] . . . 'Kyr Macarius,' &c. [as before to Paisius] . . . and I delivered to him the letter. An obeisance. Then they gave me their blessing, and to the monks and servants who were with me. And they, the most holy patriarchs, received the letters affectionately, with great joy; and having read them, they asked of the health of the tsar and the tsaritsa, and of their children by name, and of the tsarevnas, &c. I said to them that by the mercy of God, and by the prayers of the Mother of God and of the great wonder-workers of Moscow, our great hossoudar &c. and the tsaritsa &c. and their children, and the tsarevnas are all well. Then they asked of the most reverend the metropolitans &c. and of all orthodox Christians. And I said: 'By the mercy of God &c. [they are all well].' And they were graciously pleased that day in the wood to invite me to dinner, and from their table they fed me together with themselves, at one and the same table. At the second dish, having risen from table, they

asked me about the sign of the cross: 'In what way is it, then, that orthodox Christians among you make the sign of the cross on their foreheads?' And I showed them, putting together three fingers, as a figure of the M.H. Trinity, and bending together the other two. And they, having looked up to heaven, and sighed, said with tears: 'In truth that is the way in which orthodox Christians ought to make the sign of the cross on their foreheads.' Then they asked how the bishops give the blessing? And I, in like manner, putting together the fingers in the proper way, and signing with them, showed them; and they thanked God that they were united with us [in this respect] in the orthodox faith. Then they asked of the klobouk (the καμηλαύχιον), 'What kind of klobouks do the metropolitans wear, and the archbishops and bishops?' And I said: 'The metropolitans wear a white klobouk, and the archbishops and bishops black.' 'But you monks (they then asked), do you all then wear Greek klobouks, kamilauchia, and riasas?' And I said: 'Not all wear them of Greek fashion.' And they bade me to go with them to Mourom. And we came to Mourom on the 13th Oct.; and there, having treated me from their own table, having given peace and a blessing to the great hossoudar &c., and to their children, and to the tsarevnas, and to the most reverend the metropolitans &c., and to all orthodox Christians, and having sealed their letters, they delivered them to me, and dismissed me with their blessing.

The letter to the patriarch of Alexandria Paisius sent by the archimandrite Paul.

'Most supremely honourable hospodin, patriarch of Alexandria, our most gracious father and most good pastor! Not so does the firmament, beautifully spangled by God with bright stars, rejoice when the rising sun shows the beams of his radiance, as all our sacred synod, assembled by the grace of God, rejoices when now thy high-priesthood not only brilliantly illumines the horizon of our land by the coming of thy pastoral person, but also very brilliantly illuminates it by the bright radiance of heaven-inspired doctrine. For when Phœbus, the source of the stream of light to our hemisphere, enters his province, the lesser luminaries necessarily suffer eclipse of their light; and when thou, the great luminary of the ecclesiastical

heaven, enterest the limits of the empire of great Russia, we, all the sacred Russian synod and the orthodox christian Russian people, who are like the stars, are vouchsafed a superior light, &c. &c. [with more Greek bombast of the same kind]: Of which having notice by report, as one has notice of the daystar by the glow of dawn, the great hossoudar &c. rejoicing, *has suggested to us* to write this *our* anticipatory salutation, and to send it by the archimandrite Paul &c., by whom we salute thee &c., and say to welcome thee: Blessed art thou who comest in the name of the Lord, &c.! Blessed is thy going out from the borders of thy fathers, and blessed is thy coming in to the Russian land! And blessed is all thy journeying; because it is begun in *zeal for God*, and finished by *charity*. The Lord prosper thy journey and thy coming to us: and may we be vouchsafed the happiness of seeing it! As thy sons we ask thy fatherly blessing. Written in Moscow, A.M. 7175, Sept. 18 (A.D. 1666). The most humble beadsmen of thy superlative holiness. Signed, &c.

[The superscription] 'To the most superlatively holy and most entirely blessed hospodin Kyr Paisius, &c. this is to be most humbly and most reverently presented.' And a similar letter was sent to the patriarch Macarius.

IV. On the 13th Oct. there was a letter from the tsar to both the patriarchs, given in *Paisius' History*, p. 116, 117.

V. *A greeting addressed to the two patriarchs jointly in the name of the tsar and of the synod of the clergy.*

A.M. 7175 (A.D. 1666), Oct. 29, by ukaz of the tsar &c. Philaret, archimandrite of the Rojestvennoy monastery of Vladimir, was ordered to meet the most holy œcumenical patriarchs at the fortieth poprische from Moscow, at the village of Rogoje; and the words which he was to say, as from the great hossoudar and from the bishops, to the most holy patriarchs are these:

'The most religious tsar &c. [reciting the full title, with abundance of high-flown encomiums, as 'true keeper of orthodoxy and piety, and potent champion,' &c.]: Most blessed pastor Kyr Paisius, by the mercy of God pope and patriarch of the great divine city of Alexandria, of Libya, Pentapolis, Ethiopia, and all the land of Egypt, and œcumenical judge! Great hospodin, most holy Kyr Macarius, &c. patriarch of the great divine city of Antioch, of Mesopotamia, of both the Cæsareas, of Iberia,

and Syria, and all the East, father, and pastor! From you, most holy and most blessed fathers and pastors, the great hossoudar &c. Alexis Michaelovich desires with most affectionate zeal your fatherly blessing for himself [and all his family, naming the tsarista Maria Ilichna, their sons Alexis, Theodore, Simeon, and John Alexievich, his sisters Irene, Anna, and Tatiana Michaelovna, and his daughters Eudocia, Martha, Sophia, Catherine, Mary, and Theodosia Alexievna].' Then an obeisance. After which, thus:

'And he is very anxious to learn that you have been preserved in good health during this your journey.' Then another obeisance.

'And the beadsmen of the great hossoudar the tsar &c., viz. the most reverend the metropolitans, the archbishops and bishops, and all the sacred synod, as if they were here present before your most honourable high-priesthood, and were bending their heads towards your most honourable archieratical feet, beg from you, O great bishops and most blessed pastors, a blessing, and praying to the Lord God for you, do their obeisance.

'With all affection they wish to be informed of your good health, O great fathers and pastors, how the all-merciful and all-bounteous Lord God, who is glorified in Trinity, has preserved you in your journey.' A third obeisance.

And the same day, when the most holy œcumenical patriarchs were pleased to dismiss me the archimandrite Philaret from their most honourable high-priesthood to Moscow, to the great hossoudar, they said through the interpreter the archdeacon Athanasius: 'To our sons in the Holy Ghost and fellow-ministers, or rather to our brethren, the metropolitans archbishops and bishops, and all the sacred synod, we give peace and our blessing, and we desire to ask after their archieratical health. And then to the venerable archimandrites, hegoumens, protopopes, hieromonachs, hierodiacons, popes, and deacons, and to all orthodox Christians, in like manner we give peace and our blessing.'

VI. On the 2d Nov., Paisius writes at p. 119, Hilarion archbishop of Riazan, being sent out from Moscow with two archimandrites, made an address to the patriarchs: and of this he gives an abridgment. As preserved in the synodal archives, on the tenth

attached continuation of roll vii. (which is written also on the other side), it is as follows:

To-day all the land of Russia is filled with bright joy, O most holy patriarchs, our lords and fathers and pastors! To-day as the sun sheds its rays on the world, so your prelatical coming brings joy to all the Russian Church. To-day calm-generating breezes begin to blow on the storm-tossed vessel of our Church, now that the much-desired coming of your prelacy is by God vouchsafed to us. For a whole week of years, and the course of one year besides, we have been waiting for this fine weather, which now by the grace of God, the ungrudging giver of all good things, having received, we trust that we shall obtain a sabbath and rest from all manner of calamities and opposing difficulties. These our words have nothing in them of flattery when we say that the coming of your prelacy to the land of all Russia is like the rising of the sun, bringing light after a dark starless night to all the world. For so with the light of wise pastoral doctrine and the rays of virtues you shine upon us, as the visible sun with unceasing radiance illumines the sky. Beautiful and bright are the heavens with the sun and the moon, but far more beautiful and bright is now the intellectual heaven of our Russian Church, because it has in itself as it were two great luminaries both like to the sun, but not resembling the changeableness of the moon. In truth, ye two are the light of the world and the candles of the universe, not hid under a bushel, but set on the candlesticks of your most exalted thrones to give light to all people. Therefore may ye continue to shine in brightness of your virtues for very many years, even to the thousand years of Methuselah, for the spreading of the glory of the name of God, for the ornament and beauty of all the orthodox Catholic Church, for the good feeding of the flock committed to you, and for the salutary edification of all the Christian race! These good things heartily praying for your prelacy from God, we venture to desire earnestly for ourselves from your prelacy that you would say '*Peace!*' and a blessing to us. For we know that where it shall be said to them that are worthy, your peace will there rest, according to that true word of the Word who is true God: 'When ye enter into a house, salute it, saying, Peace be to this house! and if the house be worthy, your peace shall rest upon it.' We, then, that we may be worthy of your peace

and blessing, welcome with all affection your coming, and saluting you, we bend our heads to receive your blessing; and not only do we kiss your right hand which blesses us, but we also kiss your feet, saying, 'How beautiful are the feet of them that preach glad tidings of peace, who announce to us glad tidings of good things!' This doing we trust in Him who has been pleased to say that 'if two take counsel together on earth about any matter, whatsoever they ask, it shall be unto them from my Father which is in heaven; for wherever two or three shall be gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them,' that he, for the sake of your holy pastoral prayers, will give *all that we desire* to the Church; that he will give peace to his world; and that to the orthodox and Christ-loving great hossoudar &c. he will give victory and conquest over his enemies; that he will give him health and length of days, and multiply to him all good things which are suitable for both soul and body. Amen, Amen, Amen, so be it!

VII. Then Paisius (p. 120) gives an address spoken outside the outer walls by Paul the metropolitan of Kroutitz; and after that (at p. 121) he *mentions* another, viz.:

VIII. *An address spoken at the Lobnoe Miesto by Laurentius metropolitan of Kazan (here given from the synodal archives)*:

O great hospodins, most holy patriarchs, Kyr Paisius pope and patriarch &c. of Alexandria, Kyr Macarius patriarch &c. of Antioch! Not so much does the sun which unremittingly shines gladden men when after long darkness it shines forth more brightly, and gladdens them the more, nor so great is the joy of children when, after having for a time lost their father and having been in sadness, they run again into the arms of their father and their sorrow is forgotten, as is the case with us now. For in like manner we also, while we were long waiting for your all-holinesses, were in much anxiety and sadness, on account of the many chances which may happen to men; and however wistfully we might turn our intellectual eyes towards you, mentally desiring to see the faces of your arch-pastorate, still we could only as in a glass and by guess imagine them: but now when, by the blessing of Almighty God, we have been vouchsafed to behold in health your angelic faces, after your toilsome journey, as the sun all the brighter after a time of darkness, we have forgotten all those anxieties and distresses,

being illuminated and gladdened by your fatherly coming. Therefore, O most holy high-priests, for that your so great labour what return can we make to you our benefactors? We can offer only our most hearty thanks, like that grateful servant [that leper] who had been benefited with the other ten [nine] who were ungrateful. For we know that not only an actual gift, but also the remembrance of a benefit with thanksgiving is reckoned for virtue. Therefore first we thank the Lord God for having prospered your journey, and for having brought your barks to the haven of the Russian orthodox empire, and for having vouchsafed us to behold your longed-for prelacy. And then we thank yourselves for having made so long and so troublesome a journey for us, &c. But now, O our lords, forget your labour that is past, and stretch forth towards the benefits [to be done to us] which are before. The end for which you undertook it all is now plainly and easily attainable. And may God, the ungrudging recompenser, grant you *firmly* and *righteously* to accomplish it. And by your entry may the Lord bless the first and chief original desirer of your coming, our religious tsar &c. and his tsaritsa &c. [and so on with the rest of his family]; and may he defend this capital city of Moscow by your prayers from all hostile attacks, and keep all his honourable empire in peace, and subdue his enemies and opponents under his feet, and by your fatherly prayers bless us, the synod of the Russian clergy, and all the orthodox Christian people together. And to your entire beatitude may he give here a long continuance in life with prosperity, and in the world to come the hearing of that blessed voice, 'Well done, thou good and faithful servant! enter thou into the joy of thy Lord.'

And the most holy patriarchs gave peace and their blessing to the great hossoudar the tsar Alexis Michaelovich &c. and to the tsaritsa &c. [and their family], and to the most reverend the metropolitans &c., and to all the sacred synod, and to the princes and boyars &c., and to all orthodox Christians.

IX. After this Paisius (p. 121-123) gives the address spoken by Pitirim metropolitan of Novgorod in the cathedral. What follow next from the same roll of the synodal archives seem to be

X. *Troparia, to be sung in the procession, at the meeting of the patriarchs, by the singers:*

Hail, ye who have gladdened by your coming the Church of

Great Russia, most holy patriarchs, lords, fathers and pastors! hail in the Lord, in fulfilment of whose will ye have now fulfilled the work of good pastors:

When, as from a pastoral mountain, descending from the eminence of your thrones, ye were pleased to go to the countries of the orthodox Russian empire to inspect the flock of Christ, and by your wise instructions to draw it from its errors into the fold of the sheep of Christ:

To heal with spiritual medicines those whose souls were sick, to bind up the wounded, to take up upon your strong shoulders the weak, and to carry them to the heavenly Father, and give them rest in the bosom of the Church:

And in addition to all these things to *wed a worthy bridegroom to the widowed chair* of the Church.

In truth ye are excellent pastors; ye are like unto the chief of all pastors, seeking *not your own profit*,[72] but the profit of Christ and of his flock.

For this cause we with all-rejoicing hearts and most gladsome souls welcoming your toilsome arrival, receive your prelacy not in the grotto of Bethlehem, but if it were possible into our hearts and bowels [to feed us].

The chief Shepherd himself, who came and was a stranger in the grotto of Bethlehem, knows our souls, our cordiality, and our gratitude for this your journey.

Therefore He himself by his most divine icon, with his most blessed Mother, and with the rest of his servants and friends, he himself comes out to meet you, as a faithful witness of our joy and happiness in receiving you.

May He then bless you by this his life-giving cross in return for your blessing which ye come richly to pour out on us.

Pour out then on us, who bend our heads before you, your prelatical blessing.

Say 'Peace!' to our city and house. And may Christ the high-priest, who promised in Abraham to bless them that bless us, deign to fulfil that promise to-day! whom we also will not cease daily to implore to grant you in peace, and health, and honour long to direct the word of his truth; and after many prosperous years of pilgrimage in this world to give you to inherit the heavenly habitations.

[72] 'Seeking alms,' the tsar himself says elsewhere.

XV.

At p. 167. '*How Nicon was summoned by the synod*,' *&c.* And in the synodal archives among the documents headed '*Of the meeting of the most holy Patriarchs at Moscow, their stay there, and their departure*,' there are in roll vii. the following minutes, and reports:

I. To the most holy patriarchs Paisius and Macarius &c., and to all the sacred synod, we the beadsmen of the tsar &c. and yours, Arsenius archbishop of Pskoff, Sergius archimandrite of the Spass monastery at Yaroslaff, and Paul archimandrite of the Spass-Euthymieff monastery at Souzdal, seek blessing, peace, and intercession: In this year 7175, Nov. 29th, at the sixth hour of the day, we came to the house of the life-giving resurrection of Christ, and announced to the late most holy patriarch Nicon our arrival; and being bidden to come in, we went in to him, and stood, and spake to him the summons and bidding of your high beatitude, viz. that he without delay should go to Moscow *for information* about divers spiritual matters, *in humble guise, without disobedience*.[73] But he, having heard read the writing of your high beatitude sent by us, began to say: 'I have my institution to the pontificate and to the patriarchal chair not from the patriarch of Alexandria, nor from the patriarch of Antioch, but from the patriarch of Constantinople. The patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch [themselves] live not in Alexandria and Antioch, but the patriarch of Alexandria lives in [some other part of] Egypt, and the patriarch of Antioch lives at Damascus. But if the patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch are now come *with the knowledge and consent of the patriarchs of C.P. and Jerusalem* to Moscow for divers spiritual matters, "for information," in that case I also, so soon as I shall have got ready, will come to Moscow for [those] divers spiritual matters, and to give information.' But how long a time it would take him to get ready, and when he would go, he did not tell us.[74] And we informed him of the order of you the most holy patriarchs and of all the sacred synod, that we had no orders to return to Moscow without him the patriarch Nicon.[75] And he said to us: 'As soon as I

[73] A fraternal invitation, certainly, to a brother as yet untried and uncondemned, from the representatives of Christ upon earth.

[74] The patriarchs and they whose will they were doing had given him no notice beforehand, any more than he gave them.

[75] So now they not only thus rudely command without notice, but are ready, as it were, to bring him up as a prisoner.

have got ready, I will go to Moscow.' But *when* he would go there, that he did not tell us. But we without your pontifical command (ukaz) dare not return to Moscow.

II. To the great hospodin and our brother beloved in the Holy Ghost, the most reverend Paul metropolitan of Sarai and Podonsk, thy brother in the Holy Ghost Arsenius archbishop of Pskoff makes petition: In this year 7175, Nov. 30, at the seventh hour of the night, thy letter was delivered to us by thy domestic the sinboyar Thomas Nikitin. In it was written that I should let thee know what, up to the reception of thy letter, they were doing here, and what we have done. By the permission of God we had already sent word concerning that both verbally and in writing to thy prelacy: and I sent concerning the same a written account to the great hossoudar: and I ordered that those writings should be delivered to thy prelacy. And in thy prelatical letter it was written to me that when the patriarch Nicon shall be willing to go to Moscow, I, consulting with the archimandrites and with the head of the streltses, am to give orders to take strict care not to suffer the carriages that may be with him to be unloaded by the way, and that *none of his people go on before him to Moscow*. Also it was ordered me strictly and enjoined to take care that the patriarch Nicon should arrive in our company at Moscow *at the third hour of the night*,[76] or later. But if he should choose to go by himself, after his usual way, *we have no means of preventing it*. The people here with us *are few*, and our horses bad. What he, the patriarch Nicon, said to me about going to Moscow was this: 'When I am ready, I will go.' But about the time he told me nothing. But when he shall have made ready, and is about to start, we will immediately send you notice of it.

III. In the year 7175, Nov. 29, by ukaz of the tsar &c. and by the blessing of the most holy œcumenical patriarchs Kyr Paisius &c. and Kyr Macarius &c., and of all the sacred synod, the most reverend Arsenius archbishop of Pskoff and Izborsk went from Moscow to Voskresensk to the late most holy patriarch Nicon, and came to Voskresensk Nov. 29, at the fifth hour of the day. And at the sixth hour he was received by him the

[76] So the Jews took Christ into Jerusalem from Gethsemane *by night*. But they likened Nicon to a *thief* for coming *by night* in December 1664.

patriarch Nicon in his cell, and spoke to him the bidding of the most holy œcumenical patriarchs and of all the sacred synod, that he should go to Moscow with haste, for *information* respecting divers spiritual matters. And the patriarch Nicon said: 'If the patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch are come by consent of the patriarchs of C.P. and Jerusalem to Moscow "for information" about divers [lit. here and above, 'all manner of'] spiritual affairs, I also will go to Moscow.' And on the 30th day of November the patriarch Nicon in Voskresensk, after celebrating the divine liturgy with all the assembly of his clergy, went forth from that monastery of Voskresensk, and left for Moscow. And in conformity with the ukaz of the great hossoudar he entered Moscow Dec. 1 by night, three hours after dark [that is, on the night of Nov. 30].

IV. In this year 7175, Nov. 30, by ukaz of the tsar &c., and by the blessing of the most holy œcumenical patriarchs, and all the sacred synod, I Philaret archimandrite of the Rojestvennoy monastery of Vladimir was sent to the monastery at Voskresensk to the most holy patriarch Nicon to this end, that he &c. should go with speed to Moscow to the tsar &c., and to the most holy œcumenical patriarchs, and to all the sacred synod. And I &c., while yet on my way, before reaching Voskresensk, met him, the most holy patriarch Nicon, beyond the village of Chernevo, when I had gone six versts out, having started on the evening before Dec. 1, at the fourth hour of the night. And what words I spoke are written below:

'The most religious Christ-loving tsar &c., and the most holy Kyr Paisius &c. and Kyr Macarius &c., with the advice of all the sacred synod, sent to thee, in this year 7175, Nov. 29, the most reverend Arsenius archbishop of Pskoff &c. [as above], and bade them say to thee that thou shouldest come speedily to Moscow. And thou didst not obey the ukaz of the great hossoudar, and the *command*[77] of the most holy patriarchs, thou didst not start [at once] for Moscow, but didst refuse disrespectfully: and by this disobedience thou didst become rebellious against the great hossoudar,[78] and didst dishonour the most holy

[77] What right had they to command him? As for the patriarch Macarius, he owed him a debt of personal gratitude for his alms and protection in 1654, 1655, and 1656.

[78] The tsar might have had him seized by force and brought away without notice or preparation of any kind, if it had pleased him so to act, without hypo-

patriarchs and all the synod. And now the tsar of his very great mildness and long-suffering, and the most holy patriarchs and the sacred synod, overlooking thy *affronts* and *disobedience*, have sent to thee this second time Philaret archimandrite of the Rojestvennoy monastery of Vladimir, and Laurentius hieromonach of the catholicon (sobor) of the Choudoff: and he left Moscow with orders that thou come to Moscow on the 2d Dec. of this year 7175, during the second or the third hour of the night, and that thou go to the podvorie of the church of the Archangel in the Kremlin, at the Nikolski gates. And thou art to go in humble guise, with at most ten persons.'

V. In this year 7175, Dec. 2, by ukaz of the great hossoudar, and by the blessing of the most holy œcumenical patriarchs and of all the sacred synod, there was[79] sent to the monastery of Voskresensk for the third time, to summon the most holy patriarch Nicon to Moscow to the council, Joseph archimandrite of the Novospass, with Onesimus the protopope of the Spassky, which is outside the palace. And he had orders to speak to Nicon, if he should not yet have left, in the Voskresensky monastery, or else on the road wherever he should meet him, from a written paper: and a written paper was given him by ukaz of the great hossoudar, and by the blessing of the most holy œcumenical patriarchs and of all the sacred synod.

And Joseph[80] archimandrite of the Novospass said: 'By ukaz of the tsar &c., and by the blessing of the most holy œcumenical patriarchs and of all the sacred synod, I went to the most holy patriarch Nicon for the third time, to summon him, with Onesimus protopope of the Spassky outside the palace; and I met him on the road in his patriarchal village of Chernevo on the eve before Dec. 1, at the fifth hour of the night; and I summoned him, the patriarch Nicon, in writing for the third time, according to the writing given me from the synod. Such is my statement.'

---

crisy; but the patriarchs and the synod also, having treated him with discourtesy, and affecting to *share* the tsar's tyranny, he was in truth treating them with only too much courtesy.

[79] This, then, is a draft of what was intended to be sent, but Nicon anticipated them; unless it is a fault of the transcriber.

[80] The text of the MS. as *copied* begins thus: 'And the most reverend Paul metropolitan of Sarai and Podonsk &c., and Hilarion archbishop of Riazan &c., and Joseph &c., *said*' [in the singular], '*I* went,' &c.

XVI.

P. 166-199. How Nicon was summoned; and how he appeared thrice before the council, Dec. 1, 3, and 5, A.D. 1666 (though Paisius at p. 178 passes from the first of these three sessions to the third); and how, on Dec. 12th, he was definitively deposed and degraded.

Account of the same from Solovieff's *History of Russia*, &c. given for the sake of those extracts which he has made from the original minutes preserved in the archives of the foreign office at Moscow; affording an important supplement to the verbiage of Ligarides, but compiled and coloured by a writer altogether on the same side with him.

They went to work. On the 5th Nov. the patriarchs *sat three hours with the tsar alone*. On the 7th (comp. Paisius' *History*, p. 155), there were admitted to the consultation the bishops, boyars, okolniks, and people of the council. The tsar spoke to them of the departure of the patriarch Nicon from Moscow, and the bishops gave in the depositions [taken in 1660], and the extracts made from the canons. On the 28th Nov. (comp. Paisius' *History*, p. 166), there was a *third* session. The tsar read through the charges against Nicon, and asked the patriarchs to decide the matter according to the canons and according to their own discretion. The patriarchs replied that it was necessary to summon Nicon to the synod, and call upon him to answer to the charges.

The next day [29th Nov.] there were sent to summon Nicon to Voskresensk Arsenius archbishop of Pskoff, Sergius archimandrite of the Spassky monastery at Yaroslaff, and Paul archimandrite of the Euthymieff monastery at Souzdal. Nicon replied: 'I hold my appointment to the pontificate and to the patriarchal chair not from the patriarch of Alexandria nor from the patriarch of Antioch, but from the patriarch of Constantinople. The patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch are not *either* themselves resident at Alexandria or at Antioch, but the one of them lives in Egypt [at Cairo], and the other at Damascus. But if the patriarchs are come by an understanding with the patriarchs of Constantinople and Jerusalem for spiritual matters, then in that case I will go to Moscow for spiritual matters, in order to [give them] information.'

On the 30th Nov. the patriarchs, the bishops, and the synclete assembled in the stolovaia izba (the banqueting-house): the tsar sat in the imperial place, with the patriarchs near him on the left, in arm-chairs, the bishops on the right on benches, the boyars, okolniks, and people of the council on the left on benches. Declaration was made of the answer of Nicon, and it was regarded as insulting. They determined to send a second time Philaret archimandrite of the Rojdestvensky monastery of Vladimir, and the kellar of the Novospass Barlaam Palitsin, who took to Nicon the following written summons: 'Thou didst not obey the ukaz of the great hossoudar, and the bidding of the most holy patriarchs; nor didst thou come to Moscow: thou didst answer disrespectfully: but the great hossoudar, of his extreme charity and patience, and the most holy patriarchs and the sacred synod of the bishops, overlook thy insults and disobedience, and have sent to thee for the second time to bid thee come to Moscow on the 2d December, at the second or third hour of the night; not earlier than the second, nor later than the third hour; and thou art to alight at the podvorie of the Archangel in the Kremlin, at the Nikolski gates. Thou art to come in humble guise, with ten persons or fewer.'

Having sent off these messengers, the synod employed itself in reading out the *canonical Answers* sent before by the patriarchs. Paisius and Macarius testified that these canonical Answers had really been sent by them, and asked: 'According to this tome is Nicon guilty?' 'He is guilty,' replied the bishops and the boyars. Meanwhile Philaret and Barlaam had met Nicon already on his way to Moscow, where he arrived at twelve o'clock at night.

The next day, 1st Dec., at the third hour of the day, the council, in the same order as before, was already sitting in the stolovaia izba. There were sent to summon Nicon our old acquaintance Methodius bishop of Mstislaff [see the *Replies of Nicon*, p. 158-160], and two archimandrites. They were to say to Nicon that he was to come to the council 'in humble guise:' but he came, as he was always used to go, with the cross borne before him. He came in also after the manner of a patriarch into the stolovaia izba: he said the introit and the prayer for the health of the sovereign and of all the imperial house, of the patriarchs, and of all orthodox Christians; and all stood while he

was thus praying. When he had finished saying the introit, he made an obeisance to the emperor to the ground thrice, and to the patriarchs twice. They turned to him with an invitation to sit on the right side, near the imperial place. But Nicon, seeing that they were inviting him to sit on the same bench with the other bishops, and that there was no separate place for him, replied: 'I have not brought with me any seat to sit upon, so I must either sit here where I am, or remain standing: I am come to learn why *the œcumenical patriarchs* have called for me.'

Here *the tsar* came down from his place, stood before the patriarchs, and began to speak thus: 'From the beginning of the Muscovite empire there has never been such a dishonour done to the catholic and apostolic church [*i.e.* to the cathedral of the primacy] as has been done by the *ex*-patriarch Nicon. For his own caprices, of his own wilfulness, without our order, and without any synodal consultation, he deserted the church, and renounced the patriarchate, without being persecuted by anybody; and in consequence of this his departure there have been occasioned many troubles and dissensions; and it is now the ninth year that the Church is left in widowhood, without a pastor. Ask the ex-patriarch Nicon *why* he left the chair, and went away to the monastery of Voskresensk?'

The patriarchs asked Nicon this question, and he answered: 'Have you the counsel and consent of the patriarchs of Constantinople and Jerusalem [that is, an understanding with them] that you are to *judge* me? Unless you have, I will not reply to you: for my appointment is from the patriarch of Constantinople.' Paisius and Macarius referred him to the tomes as containing full powers from the other two patriarchs.

Then Nicon requested the tsar and the patriarchs to send out from the council his personal enemies, Pitirim the metropolitan of Novgorod, and Paul of Sarai and Podonsk [*i.e.* of Kroutitz], who had sought to poison and to suffocate him. Pitirim and Paul answered that that was a lie; and that the papers of the trial of the monk Theodosius were with the tsar. The tsar submitted the documents of this affair to the patriarchs.

The patriarchs again asked Nicon, why he had renounced the patriarchate? Nicon began to speak of the banquet given to Teymouraz, and repeated the enumeration of all the affronts put upon him, as he had done in his letter to the patriarchs.

The tsar replied: 'Nicon wrote to me, and asked me to do him justice against Khitroff at the time that the tsar of Georgia was dining with me; and *at that moment* to make inquest and do him justice was impossible. The patriarch Nicon says,' so the tsar continued, 'that he had sent his man on service for ecclesiastical business; *but at that time on the red staircase* (the palace stair) *there could be no transaction of ecclesiastical business;* and Khitroff struck his man for his want of manners, because he came there unseasonably, and was *making a disturbance;* and that affront *does not go back to the patriarch Nicon.* To the festivals *I could not go out owing to the pressure of business of state.* I sent to him the boyar the prince Troubetskoy and Rodion Streshneff, to desire him to return to his patriarchal chair; but he renounced the patriarchate, and said that when they elected him to the patriarchate he made a vow to remain in it only three years. I sent the prince Youry Romodanofsky to bid him for the future not style himself Great Hossoudar, because the former patriarchs had not this style; but I did not send him a message that I was *angry* with him.' Romodanofsky declared that he said nothing about the tsar's being angry. The patriarchs asked Nicon: 'What *personal wrongs* had been done to thee by the great hossoudar?' 'There were no *personal wrongs* at all,' he replied; 'but when he began to be angry, and ceased to come to the church, then I also left the patriarchate.' The tsar: 'He wrote to me after his departure, "Thou, great hossoudar, shalt be [great hossoudar] alone, and I Nicon will be as one of the common people."' Nicon: 'I did not write that.'

The patriarchs turned to the bishops, and asked them: 'What *personal wrongs* had there been done to Nicon by the tsar?' 'None whatever,' was the answer. Nicon: 'I do not speak of any *personal wrong;* I speak of the tsar's *anger.* Other patriarchs besides me in times past have fled from the anger of emperors, as Athanasius of Alexandria, and Gregory the Divine.'

The patriarchs: 'Other patriarchs left their chair perhaps, but not so as thou didst: thou didst renounce, saying: "I will be no more patriarch. If I be again patriarch, let me be anathema."' Nicon: 'I did not say that. I said: "For my unworthiness I go away." If I had renounced the patriarchate with an oath, I *should not have taken away with me a set of pontifical vestments.*' The patriarchs: 'When they ordain a man,

they say "*Dostoin!*" [in Greek Ἄξιος· He is worthy!] but thou in putting off the pontifical robes didst exclaim "*Nedostoin!*" [*i.e.* Ἀνάξιος· I am unworthy!]' Nicon: 'That is a story which they trumped up against me.'

The tsar: 'Nicon wrote in his letters to the most holy patriarchs against me many words of dishonour and reviling; but I have never written against him a word of dishonour or reviling. Ask him: Did he write all the truth, without the least addition [or exaggeration]? Was he standing up in defence of any doctrines of the Church? Does he [or did he] regard the late patriarch Joseph as most holy,[a 81] and as his brother? And has he never sold any church property[a] movable and unmovable?' Nicon: 'What I have written in my letters *I have written*. I *was* standing up in defence of doctrines of the Church. I acknowledge the late patriarch Joseph as patriarch, but whether he were holy or not is more than I know: I *have* sold church property *by ukaz of the tsar*.'

The tsar commanded that they should read out Nicon's letter to the patriarch Dionysius. When they read, 'I was sent to the Solovetsky monastery for the relics of the metropolitan Philip, *whom the tsar John IV. Vasilievich persecuted unjustly*,'[b] Alexis Michaelovich interrupted the reading, and said: 'Why did he write *such words of dishonour and reviling against the tsar John Vasilievich*, but said nothing about his own doings, how *he* had *deposed without a synod* Paul the bishop of Kolomna, had stripped from him the episcopal garments, and banished him to the Khoutinsk monastery, where he perished no man knows how. Ask him by *what canons he did all that?*' Nicon said: 'By what *canons* I deposed and banished him I do not remember, and what became of him I know not: there are the papers about him in the patriarchal dvor.' 'In the patriarchal dvor there are no papers about him, and never were: the bishop Paul was deprived without a synod,' replied the metropolitan Paul of Kroutitz.[82]

[81] The small letters—[a b c] &c.—in this account, given from Solovieff, of the reading of Nicon's letter correspond to the same letters attached above, in the full text of the letter itself, to the passages here referred to.

[82] It was true that Nicon had in this instance, and in others, acted according to the ignorance or bad customs of the time. But he might well hint to the tsar, that if he called for the documents relating to that affair, it would appear that *somebody else* had acted in the matter besides Nicon. Indeed, the

Nicon was silent. They began again to read the letter. When they came to that place where it was said that the tsar 'began to meddle with matters belonging to the patriarch,' Alexis Michaelovich said to the patriarchs: 'Ask him with what matters belonging to the bishops[c] did I meddle?' 'I don't remember[83] what I wrote,' was the reply of Nicon.

They went on reading: 'I left the patriarchate on account of the tsar's anger.'[d] 'Ask him,' said the tsar, interrupting, '*what* anger and *wrong*?'[e] Nicon: 'He gave no satisfaction against Khitroff, and he ceased to go to the church. I went away of myself: I did not renounce the patriarchate. The tsar's anger was manifested to heaven and earth. Except a sakkos and a mitre, I "took away with me" nothing at all.'

The patriarchs: 'Even though Bogdan Matveëvich struck thy man, thou *mightest have been patient:* thou mightest have imitated that patience of John the Almsgiver which he showed towards a slave. And even though the tsar *were* angry with thee, it would have been proper for thee *to consult about that with the bishops*, and to have sent to the great hossoudar begging him to *forgive* thee,[84] but not to be angry thyself.' Here was heard the voice of Khitroff, who, taking courage from the words of the patriarchs, said: 'At the time of the banquet I was engaged about the tsar's service,' so he began, 'and at that time there came the patriarch's man and *made a disturbance*, and I struck him *in ignorance;* and for that I asked pardon of the patriarch Nicon, and he forgave me.'

Voices were heard from both sides, from that of the bishops and from that of the boyars, exclaiming: 'There was no wrong whatever done by the great hossoudar to the patriarch Nicon.

---

patriarch Palsius of C.P. had first been consulted how Paul was to be dealt with, and he had replied *to the tsar and to Nicon:* 'If he is obstinate, depose him, and you will have *us* and *all our synod* with you.' And for the patriarch Macarius of Antioch, his son and archdeacon Paul, now present, had written in A.D. 1654 (and they repeated and published the same after having deposed Nicon), that the severity used against the bishop Paul of Kolomna, by the *emperor and the patriarch*, was worthy of applause, and that his *perpetual banishment was well deserved*. He relates too how Macarius, without the canonical number of *twelve* bishops, 'by authority of God *and the sultan*' had in 1659 deposed the metropolitan of Emessa. See *Travels*, &c. pp. 75, 78, 111, 169, 175, 207, and 383-384.

[83] *i. e.* 'what in particular I was then alluding to.'

[84] Promising at the same time no more to insist on his obeying the canons and the laws of God?

He went away, not in consequence of any wrong, but of his own anger.' 'When he put off the panagia and the vestments,' said the bishops, 'he said: "If I think to be ever again patriarch, may I be anathema!" he left the panagia and the staff, and took a common stick; but about any anger of the tsar he said nothing. When he had gone off to the Voskresensky monastery, his people took after him many chests containing property; and there was sent to him from the patriarchal treasury in money 2000 roubles.' The patriarchs: 'Thou didst renounce the episcopate. At putting off the mitre and the omophorion thou didst say "*Nedoxtoin!*" (Ἀνάξιος. But perhaps this should be in the interrogative form: 'Didst thou?' 'Didst thou not?') Nicon: 'About the matter of renouncing they bear false witness. If I had altogether renounced, I should not have taken away with me a set of episcopal vestments.'

They read on in the letter to where Nicon inveighs against the Code.[f] 'To that book,' said the tsar, 'the patriarch Joseph with all the sacred synod of the clergy set their hands; and thy hand also is set to it.' 'I set my hand to it under compulsion,' replied Nicon.

They read on to the account of the coming to Voskresensk of the prince Odoefsky and Paisius Ligarides.[g] 'The metropolitan and the prince,' said the tsar, 'were sent to reprimand him for his injustice; for that he wrote to me with much disrespect, and with a curse put certain letters of mine under the gospel: he reviled the metropolitan of Gaza, who has the testimony of his confessor in his favour; and who has with him his letters of consecration.' Nicon: 'I prayed against him who had wronged me; but I cursed not. The metropolitan of Gaza, according to the canons, ought not to be allowed to officiate, seeing that he has left his see, and has been living at Moscow for a long time past. I heard from the deacon Agathangelus that he was excommunicated and anathematised by the patriarch of Jerusalem.[85] I have many such mujiks. The boyar prince Nikita Ivanovich [Odoefsky] said to me in the tsar's name: "Ivan Sitin is seeking to kill thee."'[86] Odoefsky: 'I never spoke any such words; but Nicon said to me: "If you wish to kill me, give the word;" and, so saying, he bared his breast.' The patriarch Macarius said: 'The metro-

[85] And this was quite true. [86] See the *Replies*, &c. p. 598-600.

politan of Gaza was ordained deacon and priest at Jerusalem, not at Rome:[87] this I know of a certainty.'

Almiaz Ivanoff: 'When Nicon, in consequence of rumours of danger from enemies[h] [from the Tatars in 1659], came to Moscow, he then said to me that he had renounced the chair.' Nicon: 'I never said so.'

When they read in the letter that 'the tsar sent to the patriarchs many *gifts*,'[i] Alexis Michaelovich, turning to Nicon, said: 'I sent *no gifts whatever:* I wrote desiring that they should come to Moscow to give peace to the Church. But thou didst send to them with letters thy nephew, and didst give to the Kozak Cherkashenin many gold pieces.' Nicon: 'I did not give anything to Cherkashenin; but I gave my nephew money for the expenses of the journey.'

They read on about Ziuzin, about his banishment, and his wife's dying of grief.[k] The tsar: 'Ziuzan deserved for what he did to be punished with death, because he invited Nicon to Moscow without my order, and caused a great scandal: his wife's death was occasioned by Nicon, because he *gave up* her husband by showing his letter.' Nicon: 'I sent the letters of Ziuzin to the great hossoudar, to justify myself by showing that I came in consequence of those letters, and not of myself alone.' The tsar submitted to the patriarchs the [documents relating to] the affair of Ziuzin, and said: 'Nicon came to Moscow without being invited by anybody; and he would have carried away with him from the cathedral the staff[l] of the metropolitan Peter; and his inferior [lit. *young, small*] monks shook off the dust from their feet.[m] And in that what good deed did he do? and those inferior monks of his, what kind of teachers are they that they did thus? [*i. e.* are they not teachers of rebellion?]' Nicon replied: 'When the inferior monks shook off the dust from their feet, I did not *see* that; but when they came after the staff to Chernevo, they worried[n] me, and [some of] the others they would have beaten even to death.' 'No orders were given to beat anybody to death; and they were not beaten,' replied the tsar.

They read: 'Whatever people say a good word[o] for me, or

[87] Comp. Nicon's *Replies*, &c. p. 550-586 and 670; Paisius' *History*, p. 5; and *Travels of Macarius*, p. 34, and at p. 194, 'the learned man from Rome.' And yet what Macarius is made here to *say*, not that which he further *insinuates*, was the truth.

show any letters, they are sent into banishment, and delivered over to tortures.[p] The subdeacon Nikita died in bonds; the priest[o] Sisoi was made away with; the stroitel Aaron[o] was banished to the Solovetsky monastery.' 'Nikita,' said the tsar, interrupting, 'went from Nicon to Ziuzin with *seditious* letters; he was put under guard, and died a natural death of illness: Sisoi was a notorious rogue and sedition-monger; and was banished for many acts of knavery: Aaron spoke unbecoming words about me, and for that was banished. Ask him *who* was *tortured*.'[p] Nicon: 'I was so told.' The tsar: 'It was not a duty to believe seditious words, nor to write lies to the œcumenical patriarchs.'

They read: 'Bishops are appointed to different dioceses, contrary to the canons of the holy fathers, which forbid to translate bishops from one see to another.'[q] 'When Nicon,' said the tsar in reply to this, 'was in the patriarchate, *he* translated the archbishop Laurentius from Tver to Kazan, and many others he translated from one see to another.' Nicon: 'I did that uncanonically, of ignorance.' Pitirim: 'Thou thyself also wast raised to the metropolitan see of Novgorod in place of the metropolitan Aphthonius, when he was still living.' Nicon: 'Aphthonius was out of his mind. It were well [for thee] if thou wert equally out of thine.'

'From this lawless council,' so they continued to read in the letter, 'there ceased to be in Russia union with the Eastern Churches, and they separated themselves from your blessing; and accepted a lead [or initiative] from the Roman kostels to suit their own wills.'[r] The tsar: 'Nicon has reckoned us *off* [*i. e.* to have departed] from the orthodox faith and from the blessing of the most holy patriarchs, and he has reckoned us on [*i. e.* to have gone over] to the *katolik* faith, and has called us all heretics! so if only his (Nicon's) letter had reached the most holy œcumenical patriarchs, we might have been for all orthodox Christians under a curse; and for that his lying, and dark [or underhand?] letter it is the necessary duty of us all to stand up, and to be ready even to die, and so to purge ourselves from that accusation.' 'Whereby has Russia separated herself from the Catholic[88] Church?' asked the patriarchs of Nicon. 'Hereby,'

[88] The word in the original is '*Sobornoi*,' the same word as has always been used in the Slavonic Creed for the Greek καθολικὴν, though this Greek word also,

he replied, that Paisius of Gaza translated Pitirim from one metropolitan see to another, and instituted in his stead another metropolitan: and other bishops in like manner [under his lead or presidency] were translated by them from one place to another: but he had no competency to do that, seeing that he had been excommunicated and anathematised by the patriarch of Jerusalem. And even though the metropolitan of Gaza were not a heretic, he had no right [by the canons] to be living here for any long time at Moscow: I do not recognise him for a metropolitan: he has not even [so far as I know, that is, though others may say that he has] any letters of consecration: any mujik might put on a mandya, and so he too would be a metropolitan! I wrote all that I wrote with reference to him [*i. e.* to the lead taken by and accorded to him], but not of the orthodox Christians' [*i. e.* of the people and nation, who know little or nothing of what is done in the councils of autocrats]. The defence was *too plainly null*. The enemies of Nicon triumphed. On all sides there arose a cry: 'He has called us *all* heretics, and not only the metropolitan of Gaza: there must be a decree made *about this* according to *the canons!*' Nicon turned to the tsar, and said: 'If thou *hadst only feared God*, thou wouldst not have so acted by me.' The tsar made no reply.

When all were quiet again [when order was once more restored], they returned to the reading of Nicon's letter to the patriarchs. They read his complaint of the appointment of persons to spiritual offices by ukaz of the sovereign,[s] and of the oppressive exactions[t] made from the churches and monasteries. The tsar explained how the matter really stood. 'As it *used to be before* whenever the patriarchate was *vacant*,' said he, 'so it is done now with respect to the appointment of spiritual persons: promotions to spiritual degrees are made by the *bishops*, by the act of the synod. If anything has been taken from the patriarchal treasury, it has been taken *on loan*.[u] From the bishops and the monasteries there have been taken their quotas of men [of their dependents] to serve, of money, and of corn, according to former custom.[v] But he, the patriarch Nicon, for the build-

written and pronounced with a ϕ instead of the θ, *Capholicheskaia*, designates the Eastern or orthodox Church, while if written or pronounced in the way of the barbarians (the Niemtsi or Germans), with a τ instead of the θ, it designates the Latin or Roman Catolik Church.

ing of the new monastery of Voskresensk, took from the house-treasury [of the cathedral] a large sum of money, which had been taken from the bishops and monasteries in lieu of persons to be furnished for service: he also took from the bishops and monasteries many podvods arbitrarily.' Nicon replied, that he had never so taken anything.

When they read the part about Methodius being made bishop of Mstislaff,[u] the tsar said: 'The bishop Methodius was sent to Kieff not as metropolitan, but *as guardian;* and about this *I wrote* [in 1666] *to the patriarch of Constantinople.*[89]

With regard to the conduct of Pitirim, he who was blamed answered for himself: 'During the divine services in the cathedral I stood and sat in my proper place,[v] *not* in the patriarchal place. On Palm Sunday I performed the ceremony by ukaz of the emperor, not of myself alone.' Nicon: 'Thou hadst no competency to do that: that act belonged to us as patriarch.' The tsar: 'When thou wert metropolitan of Novgorod, thou didst the same thing thyself; and during the time that thou wast patriarch, the metropolitans at Novgorod, Kazan, and Rostoff, all did the same in like manner.' Nicon: 'I did that from ignorance.'

Then they went on [went back, rather] to the mention of Streshneff's dog.[w] 'Nicon,' said the tsar here, 'wrote nothing to me about this; and the boyar Simeon Lucianovich said before me with an oath that nothing of the kind had taken place.' The spiritual order testified that Nicon anathematised Streshneff irregularly without the synod; and the boyar Peter Mich. Soltikoff added that the patriarch had absolved Streshneff from his curse, and had pardoned him, and had written a letter of absolution to him.

Nicon said nothing. But when the reading of the letter was finished, he said to the tsar: 'God will judge *thee.*[x] I knew at my election that thou wouldst be good to me six years, and that then I should be hated and persecuted.' The tsar turned to the patriarchs, and said: 'Ask him *how* he knew that at his election?' Nicon made no reply.

Here Hilarion of Riazan seized the opportunity to mention other prophesyings of Nicon. 'He said,' so Hilarion began, 'that

[89] So too later his son Peter the Great, *after* he had done what he did, wrote to the patriarch of Constantinople.

he saw a besom-star (a comet) which would bring upon the Muscovite empire destruction: let him say from what sort of spirit he learned that.' Nicon: 'In the time of the old law also there were such signs: and upon Moscow too this will be fulfilled. The Lord prophesied on the Mount of Olives of the destruction of Jerusalem, which was to come to pass after forty years.'

All were tired out; especially the tsar and Nicon, who had been standing all the time on their feet. The patriarchs closed the session, after bidding Nicon go back to the podvorie.

Among the different voices raised against Nicon in the council, we have not heard that of Paisius Ligarides. He thought it best for himself to withdraw from the final *dénouement* of an affair, in which he had so powerfully taken part before, and gave in to the tsar a petition containing these words: 'I came hither not to dispute with Nicon, or to judge him, but to relieve *my see* of the debt which burdens *it*. I have received thy liberal alms, *one half of which* has been stolen from me by that thief Agathangelus. I deliver him over to an everlasting curse, as a new Judas. I beg you to dismiss me before all the synod be assembled in Moscow. If I have had so much *to suffer before* the synod, what shall I not have to sufer *after* it? It is enough, all-gracious tsar! It is enough! I cannot farther serve thy holy court (palata): let thy servant go, let him go! As one free and uncalled came I hither; so let it be free for me also to depart hence *to my own see*.'

On the 3d Dec. there was a second session. The tsar informed the patriarchs that on the evening before (that of the 2d) he sent to Nicon meat and drink, but he refused to receive it, and said that he had plenty of his own, and that he had sent no message to him, the great hossoudar, about that. 'Nicon does everything as if he were going out of his mind,' replied the patriarchs.

When the accused came in, the tsar, again stepping down from his place, made a speech to the patriarchs; and all present made petition against Nicon thus: 'Inveighing against the metropolitan of Gaza, he wrote in his letter to the patriarch of Constantinople as if all the orthodox Christendom [of Russia] had seceded from the Eastern Church to the Western *Kostel*, whereas the holy Catholic Eastern Church [of Russia] possesses

within herself the health-distilling tunic of our divine Saviour, and the wonder-working relics of many Muscovite saints, and there has not been *any sort of separation;* but we hold and believe according to the tradition of the holy apostles and the holy fathers in all truth. We petition, therefore, that the patriarchs should clear all the orthodox Christians from such an imputation.' Here the tsar and all the council bowed to the patriarchs to the ground.

'This is a matter of the utmost moment,' replied the patriarchs: 'on this behalf we must stand up resolutely. When Nicon called all the orthodox Christians [of Russia] heretics, he at the same time called *us also* heretics, as if we were come to judge among heretics. But we in the Muscovite empire see orthodox Christians: we will *for this* judge the patriarch Nicon, and defend the orthodox Christians, *according to the canons.*'

Having set forth prominently, with such solemnity of circumstance, the *capital point* of the accusation against Nicon—having shown that there could be no reconciliation with a pastor who had so fiercely wounded the feelings of his flock, who had charged it with heterodoxy—to strengthen yet more the impression made, they presented to the patriarchs documentary evidence against Nicon of the most conclusive nature, such as to prevent their giving credence to his words and pleas in justification of himself. Hitherto Nicon had constantly affirmed that he had *not* renounced the *patriarchate:* now the tsar handed to the patriarchs three letters, in which Nicon called himself '*ex*-patriarch' (*bivshi patriarch*).

The patriarchs thereupon declared: 'It is written in the laws that whoever is convicted of lying thrice, that man ought no longer to be believed in anything. The patriarch Nicon has been convicted of many lies;[90] and he ought not now any longer to be believed in anything. Whoever has slandered any one is [by the laws] subjected to the same punishment which he would have brought on him whom he slandered. He then who brings a charge of heresy against any man, and fails to prove it, incurs himself, if a priest deposition, if a layman excommunication.' (The tsar also exhibited to the patriarchs Nicon's letter [or written proposals and conditions] for the appointment of a new patriarch in his own stead.)

[90] Comp. Paisius' *History*, &c. p. 187.

The patriarchs continued: 'When Teymouraz was at the tsar's banquet-table, Nicon sent his man *to make a disturbance;* but in the laws it is written: "Whoever makes a disturbance *between kings* is worthy of death:" and as for him who struck Nicon's servant, God forgive him! for *so it ought to be done.*' At these words the patriarch of Antioch[91] rose, and *blessed* Khitroff with the sign of the cross.

And then the same patriarch of Antioch continued: 'The archbishop of Servia, Gabriel, was struck (or beaten) by Nicon's peasants in the village of Poushkina, and Nicon for that gave no redress.[92] Nay more, he, Nicon himself, in the cathedral, within the altar, during the liturgy, took off from a certain bishop his cap, and heaped on him all manner of abuse, because he did not hold the censer in such and such a way. Also he, the same Nicon, went in procession to the Jordan on the eve of the festival of the Theophany, and not on the festival itself.'[93]

On the 5th Dec. there was a third session of the council. The tsar, turning to the patriarchs, said: 'Nicon came to Moscow, and he threatens me with the judgments of God because the council decreed and sent an order to him to come to Moscow not with many people. When he came to Moscow, there was taken from him, by my order, a junior clerk of his (Shushera[94]), for this cause, that he during these nine years past brought to Nicon all sorts of reports, and caused much mischief. Nicon on account of that clerk reviles and dishonours me, and says: "The tsar persecutes me; he gave orders to take away my clerk, even when he was in the act of carrying the cross before me." If Nicon begins to speak of this in the council,

[91] In the *Travels of Macarius*, p. 64, there is a similar approbation, given with rather too much of levity: . . . 'and for the especial crime *of smoking tobacco*, they even *put them to death*. Now what shall we say, brother Gabriel, . . . except that they *undoubtedly deserve it?* And for this cause we were in great fear *for ourselves*. But we pray God for help and patience, and—*for the attainment of what we are in quest of.*' [92] Ib. p. 310.

[93] Ib. p. 279, 5th Jan. 1656. And comp. p. 315-316.

[94] Really the name is *Shuskerin*, equivalent to the Latin Christian name '*Stercorius*,' *i.e.* one who is content to be regarded by the world as dung for Christ's sake. Our historian, whose preferences are for Paisius Ligarides, by a *natural* mistake thinks this faithful disciple of Nicon and fellow-sufferer with him *really dung*, and invariably nicknames him as such, '*Shushera*.' The same name Shusher*in* occurs also among the signatures to the *Letter of Election of Michael Theod.* in 1613, and again in Roumantseff's *Collection of State Papers*, vol. iii. p. 455, No. 138, as belonging in 1650 to the volvode of Ilinsk in Siberia. Perhaps M. Solovieff would not call *these* '*Shushera*.'

then ye, O patriarchs, know how it was. Also I would have you to know this, that Nicon, before coming to Moscow, confessed, and communicated, and caused himself to be anointed [as for death] with holy oil.' The patriarchs at this were astonished not a little.

When Nicon came, the patriarch Paisius began to say to him that he had renounced the patriarchal chair with an oath, and had gone away without any legitimate reason. 'I did not renounce it with an oath,' replied Nicon: 'I called heaven and earth to witness (or testified by heaven and earth), and I went away from the tsar's wrath; and now also my will is to go wherever it pleases the tsar: what is good is not done by compulsion.' The patriarchs: 'Many heard thee renounce the patriarchate with an oath.' Nicon: 'That they invented against me; but if I am not acceptable, let the tsar's majesty send me wherever he pleases: I am quite ready to go.'

The patriarchs: 'Who gave thee authority to write thyself Patriarch of the New Jerusalem?' Nicon: 'I did not so style myself either in writing or orally.' Here Hilarion of Riazan showed a letter of his in which it was thus written exactly. Nicon: 'That is my hand; maybe it was a slip of the pen.[95]

'I have heard,' he added, 'from some Greeks that there are now other patriarchs in the chairs of Antioch and Alexandria.[96] I would ask the tsar to order testimony to be given [on this point]: let the patriarchs set the gospel before them.' The patriarchs: 'We are true patriarchs; we have not been deposed; nor have we renounced our chairs. It may be that the *Turks* have done something in our absence. But if any one has dared to invade our chairs unlawfully, *by compulsion of the sultan*, such an intruder is not a patriarch: he is an adulterer.[97] There is no need to produce the gospel: a bishop ought not to swear by the gos-

[95] Meaning: 'I did not so style myself formally or habitually.'

[96] This was the fact. The pagan sultan or his pashas were doing by the patriarchs Paisius and Macarius, for going away without leave out of their dioceses, and *out of the empire* for 'what they were in quest of,' the very same thing that those patriarchs were helping the most Christian tsar to do to Nicon for going away from Moscow without his leave, *not* out of his diocese, *nor* out of the empire, *nor for gain*, but for *what he* was *in quest of*. The sultan, however, and his pashas, whatever they may have done tyrannically, were not, like the persecutors of Nicon in the 17th century—or like certain Italians in the 19th—*hypocrites*.

[97] See the *Replies of Nicon*, p. 154, 569; and above, p. 391, 392, 399.

pel.'[98] Nicon: 'From this hour I call God to witness that I will not speak [*i. e.* to answer, as to judges] before the patriarchs so long as the patriarchs of Constantinople and Jerusalem are not here.' Hilarion of Riazan: 'How fearest thou not the judgments of God, when thou thus insultest even the œcumenical patriarchs?'

The patriarchs, turning to the council, said: 'Declare the truth about this point, of Nicon's having renounced the patriarchate with an oath!' Pitirim of Novgorod and Joasaph of Tver deposed that Nicon did renounce, and that he said: 'If I be ever again patriarch, may I be anathema!' Nicon: 'I do not turn to look back, nor say what I say that I should be again in the patriarchal chair: but whoever shall be patriarch after me, he shall be anathema. So I also wrote in time past to the tsar, that without my concurrence they cannot appoint another patriarch. I now say nothing about the chair: let it be as it may please the great hossoudar and the [four] œcumenical patriarchs.'

The patriarchs ordered the metropolitan of Amasia to read the [extracts made from the] canons in Greek; and in Russian they were read by Hilarion of Riazan. They read: 'Whoever throws up his chair of his own will, without any persecution, shall be no more allowed to hold it.'[99] Nicon: 'These canons are not those of the Apostles, nor of the œcumenical councils, nor of the local councils: these canons I neither receive nor attend to.' Paul of Kroutitz: 'These canons the Church has received.' Nicon: 'They are not in the Russian Kormchay: the Greek canons [*i. e.* if what is thus quoted is in the Greek books] are incorrect: the patriarchs have written them of their own heads; and they have been printed by the heretics [the Latins, at Venice]: and I did not renounce my chair, [*i. e.* not unreservedly, in the sense of the alleged canon]; that they have invented against me.' The patriarchs: 'Our Greek canons are correct.' Joasaph the archbishop of Tver said: 'When he renounced with an oath the patriarchal chair, we besought him not to abandon the chair; but he said: "I have once for all renounced, and I will be no more patriarch; and if I return, then let me be anathema!"' Nicon again, as before, gave the lie

[98] See the *Replies of Nicon*, p. 510-533. [99] The canon here misquoted is il. (not xii., see p. 336) of the synod held at C.P. in St. Sophia A.D. 879. Paisius above, p. 183, calls it 'xiii. of the *First and Second Council* held in *St. Sophia*.'

to that testimony. Here there rose up Rodion Streshneff, and bore witness thus: 'Nicon said that he had made a vow to remain in the patriarchate only three years.' Nicon: 'I seek not to return to the chair. [As to this] the great hossoudar is free.' Almiaz Ivanoff: 'Nicon wrote to the hossoudar that it was not fit for him to return to the chair, as a dog to his vomit.' Nicon persisted, and added:

'I am not the only one who am driven out unjustly: the same they did to St. John Chrysostom.' Then, turning to the tsar, he said: 'When there was a riot in Moscow, then thou thyself also, even thy imperial majesty, didst confess to the existence of injustice: and I, being alarmed [at the license allowed to the injustice of the boyars], withdrew from thy wrath.' The tsar: 'Thou speakest unbecoming words, and insultest me. None came to me as rioters,[1] rising against me: if the country-people came, it was not against me, but they came to petition me about their wrongs.' From on all sides there arose cries: 'How fearest thou not God, but speakest unbecoming words, and insultest the great hossoudar?'

The patriarchs: 'Why dost thou wear a *black* klobouk (*καμηλαύχιον*) *with cherubims*, and two panagias?' Nicon: 'I wear a black klobouk after the fashion of the *Greek* patriarchs:[2] I wear cherubims upon it after the fashion of the patriarchs of Moscow,[3] who have been used to wear them on a *white* klobouk. With only one panagia upon me I *left* the *patriarchate*; but the other (which is a cross) I wear for my help and protection.' The bishops: 'When he renounced the patriarchate, he did not take with him a *white* klobouk; he took the klobouk of a simple monk; but now he wears it with cherubims.'[4]

[1] The allusion is to a riot early in the reign of Alexis, when he gave up some nobles to be punished with death; and begged the life of his former governor and then brother-in-law, Boris Iv. Morozoff, promising that he should behave better in future. See Appendix I. after the *Travels of Macarius*, &c.

[2] As no longer styling myself 'Patriarch of *Moscow*,' *i.e.* of those who have broken their vow, and will not listen to me as their pastor.

[3] As not having otherwise renounced, nor having forfeited by their disobedience, the patriarchate.

[4] This is true; he did not take the white klobouk because he in a certain sense and measure threw up the patriarchate of Moscow, not as flying from his own duty, but to touch the consciences of others, and to bring them back to theirs: but he did not renounce his quality of bishop or of patriarch, though

The patriarch of *Antioch* [of Alexandria]: 'Knowest thou that the patriarch of Antioch [of Alexandria] is the œcumenical judge?' Nicon: 'Then judge thyself [by the same rule, that is, by which thou judgest us]. In Alexandria and Antioch [then] there are now no patriarchs: the patriarch of Alexandria lives in Egypt [elsewhere], and the patriarch of Antioch lives at Damascus.' The patriarchs: 'When the œcumenical patriarchs blessed Job, metropolitan of Moscow, to the patriarchate, where were they living?' Nicon: 'I at that time was not grown.'[5]

The patriarchs: 'Hear the holy canons.' Nicon: 'The Greek canons[6] are incorrect: they are printed by the heretics.' The patriarchs: 'Put thy hand to this, that our Nomocanon is heretical, and say distinctly what are the heresies in it.' Nicon declined to do this.

The patriarchs: 'Say, how many bishops [canonically] judge a bishop, and how many are needed to judge a patriarch?' Nicon: 'A bishop is judged by *twelve* bishops, but a patriarch [only] by the whole world.' The patriarchs: 'Thou *alone* didst depose the bishop Paul uncanonically.'

The tsar: 'Dost thou believe the word of all the œcumenical patriarchs? They have subscribed with their hands that the patriarchs of Antioch and Alexandria have come with their consent to Moscow.' Nicon looked at their subscriptions,[7] and said: 'I do not know their hands.' The patriarch of Antioch: 'These are the genuine subscriptions of the patriarchs.' Nicon to the patriarch of Antioch: 'Here thou hast it all thine own way. How wilt thou answer for thyself before the patriarch of Constantinople?' Voices were heard from different sides: 'How dost thou not fear God, that thou

---

he were in a sense, and without canonical fault of his own, *ex*-patriarch of Moscow. If he took a black klobouk, and had cherubim put upon it afterwards, this does not show any change of mind, but only that he had not deliberately prepared a black klobouk some days before, when he had not as yet determined on withdrawing from Moscow.

[5] Really, he was not born when Job was *first made* patriarch.

[6] Those, that is, which you have been adducing, and as you have adduced them; for Nicon was zealous—over zealous, some said—for conformity with the Greek Church of the Levant.

[7] In the tomes of 1664 apparently, which attested nothing of the kind; but the other two were no doubt parties to what was done by their silence at the time; and afterwards it was accepted and alluded to as a joint act of all the four patriarchs by all those four who were sitting in 1681.

insultest the great hossoudar and the œcumenical patriarchs, and callest the plain truth a lie?'

The patriarchs gave orders to take away from Nicon the cross which was borne before him, on the ground that no single patriarch had any such custom, and that Nicon had taken it from the Latins.

There began again a dispute about his abdication. At last the patriarchs said: 'It is written: "When forced, *even the devil* confesses the truth;" but Nicon does not [*i.e.* cannot be forced to] confess the truth.' They pronounced sentence: 'Henceforth thou shalt not be patriarch, nor shalt thou do acts of priesthood, but shalt be as a simple monk.'

On the 8th Dec. the patriarchs sat *with the tsar alone* three hours. On the 12th Dec. the patriarchs assembled with the clergy in the krestovaia hall of the patriarchate, and sent to ask the tsar to send to them some one from the synclete. The tsar sent the prince Nikita Iv. Odoefsky, the boyar Peter Michaelovich Soltikoff, the dvorianin of the council Eleazaroff, and the secretary of the council Almiaz Ivanoff. Nicon was kept waiting in the corridor or vestibule which is before the krestovaia.[8]

Presently the patriarchs went forth to a church [or chapel rather] which was over the gates of the Choudoff monastery, and stood in their places, vested in sakkoses, the bishops also in sakkoses.[9] They summoned Nicon: he came, said his prayers before the icons, bowed to the patriarchs twice to the waist, and stood on the left side of the western doors. They began to read an extract from the synodal act in Greek and in Russian.

When the reading was finished, the patriarchs came down from their places, stood at the royal doors, called Nicon up to them, and enumerated to him the counts on which he was condemned, which were the following: 'He had anathematised Russian bishops on the Sunday of Orthodoxy without any trial or judgment: By throwing up his chair he had caused the Church to be in widowhood eight years and six months: Inveighing against two bishops, he had called one of them Annas, and the other Caiaphas: Of two of the boyars, he had called

[8] Where the boyars were sometimes kept waiting in time past, till he admitted them. See the *Travels of Macarius*, p. 165.

[9] Rather in phenolia, all except the metropolitan of Novgorod, who might wear a sakkos: but at pp. 443, 447, 'in their epitrachelia and omophoria.'

one Herod, and the other Pilate: When he was summoned to the council, according to ecclesiastical custom, he had come not in humble guise, and had not ceased to revile the patriarchs, saying that they are not in possession of their ancient chairs, but are wanderers, going about out of their own diœceses; he contemned their judgment; and *all the canons of the middle and local councils held after the Seventh œcumenical council he altogether rejected:*[10] he called the [modern Greek printed] Nomocanon an heretical book, because it was printed in the Western parts: In his letters to the patriarchs he had accused the most orthodox emperor of latinising, had called him an unjust persecutor, had likened him to Jeroboam and Uzziah, had said that the syncleto and all the Russian Church had swerved aside towards the Latin doctrines (But he who reviles the flock committed to him is not a shepherd but a hireling): He alone of his own sole authority deposed a bishop, Paul of Kolomna; and after deposing him he stripped him of the mandya, and delivered him over to be cruelly beaten; and that bishop went out of his mind, and perished no one knows how, whether he was devoured by wild beasts, or was drowned in the river, or perished in any other way: His own [former] confessor he ordered to be mercilessly beaten; and the patriarchs themselves saw the scars upon him: While living in the monastery of Voskresensk he punished many people, both monks and laymen, not spiritually, not with meekness, for their offences, but cruelly tormented them with secular punishments, with the knout and with cudgels; and some he even put to the question, burning them with fire.'

When the counts against him had been read over to him, the patriarch of Alexandria took off from Nicon the klobouk and the panagia, and said to him that thenceforth he was not to be called nor styled in writing Patriarch, but was to be called simply 'the monk Nicon;' that he was to live in the monastery [to which he was to be sent] quietly, without any insubordination, and was to pray to the all-merciful God for the pardon of his sins. 'I know, without your homilies, how to live,' replied Nicon: 'but as for this, that ye have taken the klobouk and

[10] This, if it were only strictly true, would of itself alone make Nicon a Catholic; and no doubt this would have come to be true, if he had only had time and opportunities suggestive of enlightenment; for instance, if the tsar had been able to send in 1669 the Polish ambassadors to Nicon, instead of sending them to visit the two Greek patriarchs?

the panagia from me, you may divide the pearls from them between you: they will give you each five or six zolotniks of pearls, and about ten gold pieces. Ye are the slaves of the sultan, wanderers, who go about in all directions for alms, in order to be able to pay your tribute to the Turks. Whence have you taken these laws? Why do ye what ye are doing here in secrecy, like thieves, in this chapel of a monastery, without the presence of the tsar, of the council, and of the people? It was before all the people that they entreated me to undertake the patriarchate. I consented, seeing the tears of the people, and hearing the fearful adjurations of the tsar. I was made patriarch in the cathedral, before all the multitude of the people. And if now it was your wish to condemn and depose me, let us go to that same cathedral in which I received the pastoral staff; and if I am proved worthy of deposition, subject me there to what punishment ye please.' They replied to him that it was *all the same* in what church [or chapel] the decree of the council was *pronounced*, so long as it was pronounced with the concurrence of the emperor and of all the bishops.

They put upon Nicon a common klobouk taken from a Greek monk; but the episcopal staff and mandya they did not take from him, *for fear of the people*, according to some accounts, in deference to the request of the tsar, according to others.

The place fixed for the banishment of the deposed patriarch was the Therapontoff monastery of Bielo-ozero, whither there were sent with him two black priests, two deacons, one simple monk, and two laymen. As he got into the sledge, Nicon began to say, apostrophising himself: 'O Nicon! whence has all this happened to thee? "Do not speak the truth; do not lose thy friends."[11] If thou hadst only given some handsome banquets, and hadst supped with them, this would not have happened to thee.'

They carried Nicon away from the Choudoff monastery hidden within an escort of soldiers; but a crowd of the people followed after him. Behind the sledge there went the archimandrite of the Spassky monastery at Yaroslaff, Sergius; and when Nicon began to say anything, Sergius cried out: 'Be silent, Nicon!' He, turning to his former econome, said: 'Say to Sergius that if he has the power, he may come and stop my mouth.' The eco-

[11] Lit. 'friendship,' *i.e.* of the tsar especially, 'thy friend,' and of others besides, *i.e.* of the boyars, 'them.'

nome said as he was bidden, and what was more, named Nicon 'the most holy patriarch.' 'How darest thou,' cried Sergius, 'to call a simple monk patriarch?' In reply, a voice from the crowd was heard to exclaim: 'Why criest thou out so? the name of patriarch was given him from above, and not from thee, thou proud [bully].' Sergius turned to the soldiers, and bade them seize the man who had been so audacious: they replied, that he was already seized, and carried off to the proper place for him. Nicon passed that night in the zemski dvor (the police-court-house).

The next day, 13th Dec., was fixed for his departure. The tsar sent to Nicon money and a winter cloak for the road; but he did not accept them. The tsar asked for *his blessing* for himself and for all his family: Nicon did not give his blessing. The people began to assemble in the Kremlin. They were told that Nicon was to be taken out by the Sretensky road; but when the crowd had been drawn off into the Kitai-gorod, they carried off Nicon by another road. To watch over Nicon there was sent the archimandrite of the Pechersky monastery of Nijny-Novgorod, named Joseph.

On the 21st Dec. Nicon had arrived at the Therapontoff. The first business of Joseph was to require him to give up the episcopal mandya and staff. Nicon gave them up without making any objection: he asked only that the monks and laymen who had come with him should be let go freely whithersoever they wished. In place of Joseph of Nij-gorod there was sent another, also named Joseph, archimandrite of the Novospass, who had given to him this order: 'Take care that the monk Nicon writes no letters whatever, nor sends any whither. Take the strictest care that no one inflicts on him any sort of outrage. Thou art not to allow him to give orders in any matter concerning the monastery; but thou art to give him food and every sort of peace in his cells according to his need.'

XVII.

P. 166-199. Official account of the same, from the synodal or patriarchal archives at Moscow, headed thus: 'Act xiv. *Of the deposition from the chair of the late patriarch Nicon.*'

In the year 7175, Nov. 28 (A.D. 1666), it pleased the most religious tsar &c., with the consent of the most holy patriarchs,

Paisius &c. and Macarius &c., and of all the sacred synod, to send to the monastery of Voskresensk to the ex-patriarch Nicon, to summon him *to be judged* in the capital city of Moscow, before the most holy patriarchs and before all the sacred synod.

And forthwith there was sent the most reverend Arsenius archbishop of Pskoff and Izborsk, and with him Sergius archimandrite of the Spassky monastery at Yaroslaff [and Paul archimandrite of the Euthymieff monastery at Souzdal], who, being come to the monastery of Voskresensk, immediately notified to the ex-patriarch Nicon the *cause* of their coming.

But he returned an affronting answer, saying, that if the most holy patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch had come to Moscow with the knowledge and concurrence of the patriarchs of C. P. and Jerusalem, *for information about divers spiritual matters*, I also (so he said) am ready to go to Moscow.

When this answer was brought to the tsar, and the patriarchs, and all the sacred synod, they were pleased to make a second summons through a very honourable man, Philaret archimandrite of the Rojestvennoy monastery at Vladimir, who on Nov. 30, after receiving the order, went forth, and met the ex-patriarch Nicon on the road coming to Moscow; and, having saluted him, he gave him the paper, on which was written thus:

The most religious &c. the tsar &c. and the all-holiest Kyr Paisius &c., and the all-holiest Kyr Macarius &c., by the counsel of all the sacred synod, sent to thee, on the 29th of this present month of November, the most reverend Arsenius archbishop of Pskoff and Izborsk, with two archimandrites, and bade them say to thee, that thou shouldest go to Moscow forthwith: and thou didst not obey the ukaz of the great hossoudar, and the command of the most holy patriarchs: thou didst not go to Moscow, but *didst refuse disrespectfully;* and by that disobedience thou didst become rebellious against the great hossoudar, and didst dishonour the most holy patriarchs and all the sacred synod. And the great hossoudar, of his great gentleness and patience, and the most holy patriarchs and the sacred synod, overlooking thy *affronts* and thy *disobedience*, have sent to thee a second time the archimandrite Philaret, and one of the elders of the Choudoff, the hieromonach Laurentius, to bid thee come to Moscow on the 2d of December in this year 7175, during the second or third hour of the night, not earlier than the second,

not later than the third, and after entering the city to stop at the podvorie of the Archangel in the Kremlin, at the Nikolsky gates, and to come in humble guise, with only ten persons at most.

After these there was also a third summons made in the name of the sacred synod, through the very honourable man Joseph archimandrite of the Novospass and Onesimus protopope of the Spassky sobor in the palace.

These things having been thus done, the ex-patriarch Nicon came to Moscow on the 1st of Dec.; and immediately the whole sacred synod having assembled, viz. the most holy patriarchs themselves, Kyr Paisius &c. and Kyr Macarius &c., the most reverend metropolitans Pitirim of Novgorod, Gregory of Nicæa, Laurentius of Kazan and Sviajsk, Cosmas of Amasia, *Athanasius of Iconium*, Jonah of Rostoff and Yaroslaff, Philotheus of Trebizond, Paul of Sarai and Podonsk, Daniel of Varna, *Paisius of Gaza*, Epiphanius of Georgia, Theodosius of Bielgorod and Boiansk [of Servia], Theophanes of Chios, the most reverend archbishops Simon of Vologda, Joseph of Astrachan, Ananias [Anastasius] of Mount Sinai, Philaret of Smolensk, Stephen of Souzdal, Hilarion of Riazan, Joasaph of Tver, Arsenius of Pskoff, Manasses of Pogoniane, the god-loving bishops Michael of Kolomna, Lazarus Baranovich of Chernigoff and Novgorod, Alexander of Viatka, *Methodius of Mstislaff and Orsha*, Joachim Diakovich of Serboslavonia, the most venerable archimandrites Matthew of the great church of Alexandria, Joasaph of the Troitsa of St. Sergius, Philaret of the Rojestvennoy of Vladimir, Joachim of the Choudoff, Joseph of the Novospass, Barnosophius of the Simonoff, Parthenius of the Yourieff, Joseph of the Bogoroditsin at Sviajsk, Misael of the Preobrajensky at Kazan, Barnabas of the Sabbin at Zvenigorod, Cyril of the Hypatieff at Kostroma, Joseph of the Pechersky at Nijny Novgorod, Joseph of the Khoutinsk at Great Novgorod, Moses of the Cyrilloff at Bielo-ozero, Sergius of the Zaliessky at Goritz, Joseph of the Loujiesk at Mojaisk, Dionysius of the Bogoyavlensky at Kozloff, Paphnutius of the Andronikoff, Gerasimus of the Bogoyavlensky behind the market, also the most venerable archimandrites and honourable hegoumens Arsenius of the Znamensky in the old palace, Sergius archimandrite of the Spass at Yaroslaff, Parthenius of the Paphnutieff at Borofsk, Paul archimandrite of the Spass at Souzdal, Bartholomew archimandrite of the Solovetzky, Benedict

protosynggelos of the great church of Alexandria, Leontius hegoumen of St. Sabba of Alexandria, Dionysius hegoumen of the Iversky of Mount Athos, Tichon of the Vozdvijensky, Moses of the Novinsk, Hermogenes of the Zlatooustoff, Pachomius archimandrite from Georgia, Solomon archimandrite from Bulgaria, John from Reis economus of the great church of Antioch, the very honourable protopopes Michael of the cathedral of the Assumption, Andrew of the sobor of the Annunciation [the Blagovieschensky], Kondratus of the sobor of the Archangel, Onesimus of the Spassky in the palace at the vestibule, Clement of the Nikolsky, Maximus of the Pokrovsky at the fosse, Jacob of the cathedral at Chernigoff, Paul of the prince St. Alexander Nefsky; and very many other persons of the sacred order, both monks and white clergy:

All these having assembled in the tsar's hall called the stolovaia (the banqueting-hall), the divinely-crowned autocrat presiding, and his illustrious imperial synclete being also there all present in good order, there were sent to call to the council the ex-patriarch Nicon the god-loving Alexander bishop of Viatka and Veliko-Perm, and Methodius bishop of Mstislaff and Orsha, and Joseph archimandrite of the Pechersky at Nijny Novgorod. And he, Nicon, forthwith obeyed the summons, and went forth with the cross borne before him, and giving his blessing to the people: and, having come into the hall where the synod was, he stood before the synod, read the Ἄξιον ἐστὶν κ.τ.λ., and when he had made the dismissal, he was honoured with a word from the most religious autocrat that he should sit. He replied that he had not brought with him a seat to sit upon: and so he stood before the most holy patriarchs.

And the religious tsar also arose, and began to state his pain, or rather that of all the Russian Church, before the most holy patriarchs and all the sacred synod, and to lament the nine years' widowhood of the Church which had been caused by Nicon by his *disorderly* departure from the chair. Owing to that many schismatics and disturbers of the peace had arisen, and had begun to rend the unity of the Church, and to draw down to hell by their deceitful doctine many souls of such as were deceived by their iniquity. And the most holy patriarchs were astonished at the flowing tears of the tsar: and they themselves could scarcely refrain from tears.

And they asked through an interpreter (for they themselves had no knowledge of the Slavonian tongue), for what cause did he quit the patriarchal chair? Nicon replied: 'I withdrew from the anger of the tsar.' In answer to this the religious tsar *called God to witness* that he *had no anger against him.* On the contrary, as *having been born and bred up in piety*, he *had ever honoured him as a father*, and had wished to continue to do so, *without change.*

Here Nicon was asked why, when he quitted the chair, and put off the sacred episcopal robes, did he swear that he would never return to the chair, nor think of doing so? He replied by denying this. '*I never so swore*,' he said, '*at all.*' But being confuted by *a great cloud of witnesses*, he was covered with shame and confusion.

He was questioned also about many other charges *which were to be mentioned in the manifesto* of his deposition. But he was on every point destitute of any sufficient defence, and quite unable to answer. And if he said anything, it was not said as became a bishop, or any other man of honour, but *very lightly*, and *without any agreement with truth.*

Above all, *he was put to shame*[13] by his letter which he had sent *secretly* to the most holy Greek patriarchs, and which he had filled with many lies and calumnies against the most religious autocrat, and against all the orthodox empire. The reading of this letter and the examination of the other charges lasted from the fourth hour of the day even to the second hour of the night, when the religious tsar and the most holy patriarchs and all the sacred synod departed every man to his own quarters; and Nicon was allowed to go back to the podvorie of the Archangel.

Again, on the 5th of Dec. all the sacred synod assembled in the same stolovaia hall of the tsar, where the orthodox tsar himself, the defender of piety, with his illustrious synclete, with the princes and the boyars, and the other people of the council were present. And it pleased the divinely-crowned autocrat, the most holy patriarchs, and all the holy synod, that the ex-patriarch Nicon should be summoned by the same god-loving bishops Alexander of Viatka and Methodius of Mstislaff, and by

[13] But Nicon told the tsar before the council that by causing this letter to be read aloud he was publishing *his own* shame.

the most honourable man Joseph archimandrite of the Pechersky monastery at Nijny.

And he, having been summoned, went in a sledge, blessing the people, and having the cross borne before him. And having come, he stood before the most holy patriarchs and before all the council.

But because *after having abandoned the patriarchal chair* he came thus a second time with the cross borne before him, as if he were still a patriarch, and not in humble guise, as befitted one *under trial*, the most holy patriarchs ordered their archdeacon to take the holy cross away from his cross-bearer. And so it was done.

Then there was read in the ears of all, in the Slavonian tongue, a translation from the rolls (the tomes) of the most holy orthodox patriarchs, the same rolls also in the original Greek, with the subscriptions of the hands of the most holy patriarchs and of many other Greek bishops, lying before them. Therein were contained extracts from the canons of the seven holy œcumenical councils and the other local councils, and from different writers of canons received by the Church, telling against the offences of Nicon.

There was laid too, in the sight of all, a copy [printed at Venice] of the book of the Nomocanon entitled the Eastern, which Nicon, not knowing what to say, called heretical. Then the most holy patriarchs, taking up that book, began to kiss it, extolling it with high praises; and they asked the Greek bishops who were there present whether they received it as accurate and uncorrupted. And they all said: 'We receive it, and kiss it.' Then Nicon was quite without an answer, and as a man who finds no excuse in his sins.

Then the reading of the above-mentioned collections was continued. And after they had been read, the orthodox tsar took his departure, as did also the most holy patriarchs, and all the sacred synod. And they went every man to his own quarters.

And Nicon went away to the podvorie of the Archangel, not blessing the people, nor having the cross borne before him.

After this, on the 12th day of December, all the most reverend metropolitans, and archbishops, and god-loving bishops, archimandrites, and hegoumens, and all the sacred synod assem-

bled, and came to the most holy patriarchs into *their* hall [the hall in the patriarchal residence] called the krestovaia. There came thither also from the most illustrious monarch religious princes and boyars, the boyar prince Nikita Ivanovich Odoefsky, the boyar prince John Alex. Vorotinsky, the boyar prince Peter Mich. Soltikoff, the dvorianin of the council Procopius Kouzmich Eleazaroff, and the stolnik prince Peter Semen. Prozoroffsky, and other stolniks of the tsar's illustrious majesty.

And the patriarchs and all the sacred synod sent the godloving Methodius bishop of Mstislaff and Orsha, and with him Joseph archimandrite of the Pechersky of Nijny, to summon Nicon to the patriarchal hall, the krestovaia, to appear before the synod. And he came when summoned, not giving his blessing to the people.

When he had come near to the presence of all the sacred synod, the most holy patriarchs and all the rest of the bishops entered into the church of the Annunciation of the most holy Mother of God, which is over the back gates of the holy convent called the Choudoff, and were vested in their *epitrachelia* and *omophoria*, having their mitres on their heads.

And when Nicon also had come in thither, the most holy patriarchs bade him listen to the reading of the synodal judgment, which was read first in Greek by the economus of the apostolic chair of the great church of Antioch, the priest John; and afterwards it was read aloud in Slavonic by the most reverend Hilarion archbishop of Riazan and Mourom, being word for word as follows:

(Declaration or manifesto of the complete deposition and degradation of Nicon.)

'In the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, Amen. Whereas Nicon, heretofore patriarch of Moscow, troubled the most mild long-lasting reign of our religious orthodox tsar, &c. [with full titles] and disturbed all his orthodox empire, interfering in matters which belonged not to the patriarchal office and authority, *the heads of which our god-crowned tsar sent to us the four œcumenical patriarchs* and informed us about them, asking us whether it was fit that the patriarch should interfere in such matters, and more particularly inquiring respecting that disorderly act which Nicon had done in the midst of the cathedral, when stripping himself of all his episcopal vestments he cried

aloud: "I am no more patriarch of Moscow; nor will I be any more a shepherd, but a sheep, as being sinful and unworthy;" having done thus, and having made this declaration, he went out in great wrath and agitation, and cast off his patriarchal eminence, and abandoned the flock committed to him without any manner of compulsion or design against him, being moved only by some human passion, and because he had failed to obtain vengeance against a certain honourable man of the tsar's synclete who had struck his (the patriarch's) servant, and had driven him away from the tsar's banqueting-hall, the same man being a layman. And on this account he pretended to go away to a place of penitence and quiet, to lament for his sins in a monastery which he had himself founded. However, while living there, he still continued to do episcopal acts, ordaining without hindrance, and consecrating, and reconsecrating, and building monasteries, and giving them unbecoming titles, and vain names of New Jerusalem, Golgotha, Nazareth, Bethlehem, Jordan, and Galilee, making a jest of divine things, and dealing irreverently with holy things; calling himself Patriarch of the New Jerusalem, plundering like a robber, so that if he had been able and had had time, he would have possessed himself of the third part of the empire. And though he certainly abandoned his chair altogether, nevertheless afterwards, changing his mind, he prevented by divers mischievous devices the creation of any other patriarch. For the religious autocrat, the most reverend bishops, and the boyars, knowing his knavery, his audacity, and his impudence, did not venture to consecrate a fresh patriarch to the chair of Moscow, lest there should be two patriarchs at once, one within and the other without the city, with a divided authority. And on that account our most potent hossoudar the tsar desired to obtain the personal presence of the œcumenical patriarchs in Moscow, that they might see with their own eyes the deeds that have been done by him, and judge of them, and that his most illustrious imperial throne might be vindicated, and might be secured against the danger of any popular obloquy in time to come: that they might not be able to say that Nicon had been driven out from the patriarchate by any human passion. However, owing to the unsettled state and anomaly of the times, and likewise owing to fear of the infidels, the other two most holy œcumenical patriarchs were not able to go to Moscow,

in order there to judge of what had taken place, either personally or through exarchs sent to represent them. But, behold, we two patriarchs, Paisius &c. and Macarius &c., by the grace of God and by the care of our long-lived and most mild tsar, have come to Moscow, *with the counsel and consent of the other two most holy patriarchs* our brethren and fellow-ministers, in order to examine and judge of the acts of Nicon according to the canons of the Apostles, and of the œcumenical, intermediate, and local holy councils, and of every other ecclesiastical matter concerning this country which may need it.

'We then, having come to Moscow, and having made careful examination, have found the aforesaid Nicon guilty, and liable to canonical punishment [lit. a debtor] in respect of many and divers charges. Among these are the following: That he cursed Russian bishops on the Sunday of Orthodoxy, without any trial or judgment. That by deserting the chair he caused the holy Church to be in widowhood for eight years and six months, during which vacancy of the patriarchate many were scandalised through the same, and there arose many schismatics and agitators disturbing the orthodox Russian Church, and by their deceptive teaching destroying the souls of numbers of people. Farther, that insultingly, after the manner of irreligious jesters, he nicknamed two bishops Annas and Caiaphas; and in like manner two of the synclete of the tsar's boyars and commissioners he nicknamed Herod and Pilate. Again, when Nicon was summoned, after the custom of the Church, to come and make answer canonically to the charges alleged against him, he not only did not come in humble guise, as we, *out of brotherly charity*, prescribed, that so we might obtain for him more indulgence, but quite the contrary, he, when he appeared before the council, immediately began (as he had done also before) even to accuse us, saying, that we were not in our ancient chairs, but wanderers, going about, and living out of our sees, the one of us in [some part of] Egypt, the other in Damascus, without being in possession of [our nominal] chairs. Farther, he contemned our patriarchal judgment, calling it "stuff," on this account, that we adduced against his offences canons, making expressly against the same offences, which he called "falsifications," especially canon ii. of the council held in St. Sophia, which decrees thus: "A bishop who descends from his chair to the place of

penitents[14] cannot do episcopal acts." This canon he altogether rejected. And *all the canons of the intermediate and local councils held after the Seventh œcumenical council he altogether rejected.* But one may see even from the episcopal ordinal that he who is to be consecrated a bishop is required to profess that he receives all the ecclesiastical traditions [written and] unwritten, and the œcumenical, *intermediate*,[15] and local councils, especially those held at C.P. in the glorious church of the Wisdom of God the Word, as also in the divinely-guarded palace against Barlaam of Calabria [in A.D. 1276], and against Akindynus and their followers, by which councils the Seventh œcumenical council was faithfully confirmed. And, what is more, our own interpretations and statements, which acting in concert as supreme bishops and teachers of the Church of Christ we composed, he declared to be "utter trash."

'For the greater confirmation of our words, and to strike the more generally those present at the time, we brought forward the book of the Nomocanon called the Eastern, which contains the imperial law. But this book he with great impudence called heretical, because it was printed in the countries of the West.

'Farther, in certain letters which were sent by him to us the four patriarchs, but which *came into the hands* of the most clement tsar, he charged our most orthodox hossoudar the tsar &c. with *latinising*, calling him also a persecutor, and unjust, and comparing him to Jeroboam and to Uzziah. In like manner he slandered the synclete and all the Russian Church, as turning aside to the Latin doctrines. But this he said with a special reference to the metropolitan of Gaza Paisius, being moved with envy, *because he knew him to be habitually in communication with the illustrious synclete* concerning certain affairs. But for this, that he reviles the flock committed to him, he is with good reason both considered and openly declared to be not

[14] That is, he who takes 'the great *schima*,' which Nicon did not do, but took away with him when he left Moscow the vestments necessary for celebrating episcopally. Besides this, Nicon *might*, if he pleased, object against the canons of that council as being of force only in those parts for which the council was held, or in which they had been since deliberately and *synodically* received.

[15] But where is this to be found in the old *Slavonic* Pontifical? It is nothing to the purpose to quote their own Greek ordinals then in use within their own patriarchates. Nicon, however, *did* receive the two Councils of Photius.

a shepherd but a hireling, as one that layeth not down his life for the sheep.

'Farther, he by himself alone deposed a bishop without any local synod, in which he ought first to have proved against him his canonical offences. But we well know that the œcumenical patriarch Luke did not recognise the deposition decreed by John archbishop of Cyprus, with only eleven bishops, against the bishop of Amathus for this one reason only, that the number was not complete, the number prescribed being twelve, besides the metropolitan. But the deposition of Paul the bishop of Kolomna was made not by eleven bishops, but by one only; and he, Nicon, fiercely stripped him of his mandya, and subjected him to cruel blows and punishment, forgetting the rule that no one is to be punished twice for one and the same offence. In consequence hereof it came to pass that the same bishop went out of his mind, and perished miserably, no one knows how, whether he was killed by some wild beasts, or fell into some water and was drowned, or came to his end in some other way. Moreover, even his own confessor he commanded to be beaten unmercifully, so that he was even excoriated on the feet, and we ourselves have seen his scars. Afterwards, while he was living in the monastery at Voskresensk, there were many people both monks and seculars, whom for their offences he punished not with spiritual mildness, but with cruel secular punishments. Some he ordered to be beaten unmercifully with the knout, others with cudgels, and others he ordered to be burned or branded, as if putting them to the question. Many persons owing to these severities were even deprived of life, as *credible* reports testified.

'But having ascertained that Nicon did not show episcopal meekness, but practised tyranny and injustice, gave himself to plundering, and incurred the guilt of cruelties, we, in obedience to the canons of the apostles and of the œcumenical, intermediate, and local holy councils, have decreed him to be incapable of doing any sacerdotal acts, so that he may for the future no more act as a bishop. For we by the grace of God the patriarchs, being vested in our omophoria and epitrachelia, have altogether deposed and degraded him, in conjunction with all the local synod of the Russian bishops, and with the Greek bishops who were present in Moscow, declaring that from henceforth he is to be accounted and called simply as a common monk, 'the

monk Nicon,' but no more patriarch.' And in his room we have all of us with one accord determined to elect another patriarch to the most holy chair without any delay, against whose legitimacy there can be no ground for cavil. And the place of Nicon's abode *till his death has been appointed* to be in a certain monastery, to the end that he may without interruption and in quiet bewail his sins. And it is ordered that there be with him in charge of him some archimandrite, a man of virtue and experience, for the sake of security, that no disorderly person [*i.e.* none of the fanatical raskolniks] presume to insult him or do him any harm, and that he himself also for the future may not be able to concoct any intrigues. Farther, it has been notified that there shall be with him an honourable dvorianin, with a few people of the [tsar's] service [*i.e.* soldiers] under him, for the sake of perfect security, and that no writings tending to excite disturbances find their way either to him, or from him to others.

'All these things we have done *canonically*, without any manner of *respect of persons*, and without *any* prejudice or partiality in judgment; but fearing that eye of God which cannot be evaded (*for God has an eye to search out and to punish*), and fearing that future judgment-seat which will award punishments according to deserts, and considering in our minds and thoughts in this world and in the world to come the endless torments of unquenchable fire, we have judged and pronounced a *righteous* and *godly* judgment.

'This is done in the year of the world 7175, Dec. 12th [A.D. 1666] in the *fifth year of the Indiction*. [In the original there follow all the signatures as given above at p. 439; and the same written act of degradation is written also on a similar leaf in Greek with the subscriptions of all the same hands.]

Immediately after this notification had been read, the most holy patriarchs took off from Nicon's head the kamilauchion on which were the cherubim embroidered in pearls; and they put on him another plain one without cherubim. They took off from him too the panagia (ἐγκόλπιον). Only they suffered him to remain still in the mandya with stripes, which, however, they ordered Joseph the archimandrite of the Pechersky of Nijny Novgorod to take from him so soon as he should be arrived at the Therapontoff monastery, and to send it to the cathedral of the Assumption, to the patriarchal sacristy. And so, having

been stripped of the primacy, he is a common monk. And he was dismissed immediately afterwards to return to the podvorie of the Archangel, *where*[16] *he passed the night.* And the next day he was carried off to the above-mentioned Therapontoff monastery. And when he had arrived there, he gave up the episcopal mandya; he gave up also the staff to the archimandrite Joseph, who took them, and sent them to the house of the B. Virgin, to the patriarchal sacristy, on the 27th of the same month. (See also Roumantseff's *Collection, &c.* vol. iv. p. 182.)

(Act xv.) In the name of the great God, King of kings and Lord of lords, &c., to the monarch bearing the sceptre of rule in the great Russian empire, Alexis Michaelovich, &c., in the year of the world 7175, Jan.—(A.D. 1667.)

After the mournful act of the deposition of Nicon, the Lord God has been pleased to dart upon the sadly-widowed Church rays of gladness, and to provide and give her by his divine providence a bridegroom. For by the command of the god-crowned autocrat all the sacred synod was assembled, viz. the most holy Macarius patriarch of Antioch, &c. the most reverend metropolitans, the most reverend archbishops, the god-loving bishops, the most venerable archimandrites, the very honourable hegoumens, the venerable archpriests, &c. All these then assembled in the cathedral of the Assumption; and in concurrence with the divine grace they elected three very worthy men, that one of them, whichever the most religious autocrat should please, might be raised &c. to the patriarchal chair. These three were the most venerable fathers Joasaph archimandrite of the Troitsa monastery of St. Sergius, and Cornelius archimandrite of the Tichvin monastery of our Lady, and the very honourable monk Sabba kellar of the Choudoff. Having been informed that these three were chosen, the autocrat, under the influence of God, desired, in concert with the most holy patriarch of Antioch, and with all the sacred synod, that the rational flock of Christ should be fed by the most venerable father Joasaph, &c., and that he should be placed on the eminence of the patriarchal chair.

And on the morrow, Jan. 31, all the synod being assembled, and the tsar's illustrious synclete, in the presence of the divinely-crowned wearer of the purple, in the tsar's great hall called the

[16] But compare Solovieff's account above, at p. 437.

stolovaia, only the most holy Paisius the patriarch of Alexandria being absent from illness, the name of the most venerable father Joasaph was made known and proclaimed as that of the man who was to take the helm of the great church, &c.

This having been heard by all the synod, it rejoiced with exceeding joy. And immediately the patriarch-elect was honoured by all as father of fathers, and was conducted into the cathedral of the chair, where having returned thanks to Almighty God, and having saluted the holy icons, he was with all honour conducted away to his own residence.

Afterwards, having received his ordination and institution in due order, he became a good ruler of the Church, and an extirpator of the newly-sown schisms.

XVIII.

At p. 197: 'There appeared before them Leonidas,' &c. As belonging to the same time, we here insert from the synodal archives some other documents, connected with the deposition and degradation of Nicon by the Eastern patriarchs.

I. Dec. 6, A.D. 1666 (Nicon having been condemned the day before in the session of Dec. 5, though he was not formally degraded till the 12th): 'From the tsar &c. to Philotheus archimandrite of the Iverskoy &c., and to Paisius the vicar (*namiestnik*). From the time that this reaches you ye are to give no sort of authority to the elder Euphemius, econome (*stroitel*) to the late patriarch Nicon, nor allow him any sort of management of the estates of the monastery. And if any others be sent from the late patriarch Nicon to you to the monastery, or to the estates of the monastery, ye are to give the same directions, that they are not to be listened to in anything: nor are they to be allowed any voice in any matter of business: nor are any movables, nor icons, nor anything else, without our imperial ukaz, to be given up to them: but ye are to live in that monastery and to govern yourselves until our farther order. And ye shall come to us &c. to Moscow, and ye shall bring with you the elder Philagrius (with his companions), who was sent to you from the late patriarch Nicon. And ye are to bid him send whom he pleases of his own people to Moscow, to appear in the krestovaia hall in the patriarchate before the sacred synod. Written at Moscow, A.M. 7175, Dec. 6 (A.D. 1666).' 'Such a letter

was taken by the *archimandrite of the Choudoff*, on the 7th Dec., at the sixth hour.'

II. Dec. 9, A.D. 1666. 'The blessing of the most reverend Paul metropolitan of Sarai and Podonsk, to Philaret archimandrite of the Rojestvennoy monastery, and to the secretary Abraham Koshchireff. Information has been given to the most holy patriarchs Paisius and Macarius, and to all the sacred synod, that the late patriarch Nicon, when he was in the Voskresensk, the Iverskoy, and the Krestnoy monasteries, inflicted on monks of those monasteries, and on their servants and peasants, and on other people not belonging to them, civil punishments, giving orders to beat some with the knout, and to hurt their hands and feet, and to put others to the question, and to punish them with civil punishments: and some people who had been so punished or racked have even died. Ye are to make strict examination *without publicity*, so that there is no noise about it, whether there be any one of the monks or servants or peasants, or of others not belonging to the monastery, on whom the late patriarch Nicon, when he was in the Voskresensky, or Iversky, or Krestnoy monasteries, inflicted any civil punishments, and what are their names? At this present time where are those persons? And whether there be not any of the persons so racked or punished who is dead? You are to make inquest about all this secretly, so that exact information be obtained; and you are to send to Moscow the archimandrite Sergius, who was archimandrite in the Krestnoy. This is written by me to you *after taking the pleasure of the great hossoudar*.' 'Sent Dec. 9, in the night, three hours after dark, by the metropolitan's sin-boyar Thomas, with whom was the patriarchal groom of the stables, Fedoshko.' 'The original was written by the secretary, Alexis Fedoroff.'

III. (Dec. 12.) 'From the tsar &c. to Theophanes archimandrite of the Krestnoy monastery in the riding of Kargopol, to the hieromonach Dionysius the vicar, and to the monk Irenarch the econome, and to the monk Ignatius the treasurer, with the brethren. By order of us the tsar &c., and with the blessing of the most holy œcumenical patriarchs &c., and of all the sacred synod, there are sent to you to the monastery the monk Barlaam &c., and the under-secretary Abdias Fedoroff &c. But what they are ordered to do with you at the monastery is written

in their instructions. And when this our letter reaches you, and they have arrived, they will speak to you of all, and ye are to obey them in all things. Written at Moscow, A.M. 7175, Dec. 11 (A.D. 1666).' And another separate letter from the tsar to the same, dated on the 12th, after naming the commissioners sent to them, continues thus: 'And with them is sent the former archimandrite of the Krestnoy, Sergius. And when this reaches you, and they are come, ye shall bid your former archimandrite Sergius to abide in the monastery, and shall give him sufficient food and clothing: but ye shall not let him go out any whither until our farther order. Written at Moscow, Dec. 12.'

'Such a minute was given to him the ex-archimandrite Sergius.'

'A.M. 7175, Dec. 12 (A.D. 1666), by the will of the great hossoudar &c., and the blessing of the most holy œcumenical patriarchs &c., and of all the sacred synod, the monk Barlaam kellar of the Novospass, and the under-secretary Abdias Fedoroff, are ordered to go to the Krestnoy monastery, the foundation of the late patriarch Nicon, in the isle of Kia, in the riding of Kargopol: and when they be come thither they are to take the archimandrite and the kellar and the treasurer, and in their presence make an inventory in the churches of the icons, and of the settings of the icons, and of all the furniture of all kinds, of the books and vessels for divine service; also of the brethren who are in the monastery, and of the servants: and in the treasury of the monastery they shall make an inventory of the money there, and of all other treasure and objects of value, and of all deeds and writings. And after making this inventory they are to give orders that the archimandrite, the kellar, and the treasurer, and the collegiate elders are to govern that monastery till the tsar's farther orders: that they are to live separately (*i.e.* not in community); and if anybody be sent to them to the Krestnoy monastery from the late patriarch Nicon, they are to pay no sort of attention to any persons so sent. Also they, the same kellar and under-secretary, are to make an inventory of all estates, lands, villages, and hamlets, &c. belonging to that monastery, and of the peasants on them, and of the peasants without land, and of all manner of rights and advantages, and salt-pans, and fisheries; and they are to question the head-man of each of those estates, and the sworn-men, and the peasants, at what rates and what obroks did they pay to the late patriarch Nicon and to

the monastery? what services did they render in ploughing arable lands, and supplying podvods of different kinds, and giving their labour? And in former time, when those estates belonged to the great hossoudar, at what rates did they, the peasants, then pay to the treasury of the great hossoudar?

'And you are to order them to send from the Krestnoy monastery the monk Eustratius, who was sent from the late patriarch Nicon from the monastery of Voskresensk, and the subdeacon Ivan, and the poddiak Vaska, who was beaten in the monastery of Voskresensk, and sent to the Krestnoy.

'And you, the kellar Barlaam, and the under-secretary Abdias, are to examine who of the brethren and servants and peasants have ever by command of the late patriarch Nicon been beaten with the knout, or have had their hands or feet hurt, or have been put to any tortures, and for what causes. And whoever in the course of the examination shall appear to have been beaten or hurt or tortured, they are to take from the same people written depositions under the hands of their spiritual fathers, and are to send them to Moscow with speed.

'And having made the inventory in the monastery of all the church-furniture and all the monastic treasure of all kinds, and of the brethren, and the servants, and estates, and all manner of revenues, and peasant serfs, and peasants without lands, and having made of all that a book, they are to command the serfs and the peasants without lands of that Krestnoy monastery to be in all things obedient to the archimandrite, and the kellar, and the treasurer, with the brethren of that same monastery. And then they, the kellar Barlaam and the under-secretary Abdias, are to return to Moscow.' ('Affixed is the house-seal of the patriarchal prikaz.') 'Countersigned by *Sotoff*.'

IV. (Dec. 11.) 'The blessing of Paul metropolitan of Sarai and Podonsk &c., to the secretary Abram Kashcheyeff. By ukaz of the great hossoudar &c., there has been sent to the monastery of *Voskresensk* the secretary Denis Sobloukoff; and he is ordered to be with the archimandrite Philaret in that place: and thou art to return to Moscow. And when he, Denis, shall be come to the monastery at Voskresensk, thou art to communicate to him thy instructions as to what thou wert to do with the archimandrite Philaret: and whatever there remains still undone, he, Denis, is to do, according to the ukaz [of the

tsar], and thou, relinquishing to him thy commission, art to return to Moscow.' ('Denis was sent Dec. 11.')

V. 'A.M. 7175, Dec. 13, with the blessing of the most holy patriarchs &c., and of all the sacred synod, to Joseph archimandrite of the Pechersky at Nijny. He is ordered to go with the monk Nicon, late patriarch of Moscow, to the Therapontoff monastery at Bielozersk, and to remain there with him the monk Nicon till farther orders. And on the road he, the archimandrite, is to take care that the monk Nicon writes no letters, nor sends any whither. In like manner he is to watch that monastery strictly, that no man do Nicon any manner of hurt. And on arriving at the monastery he is to take away the archimandrite's mandya and the staff. And if he will not give them up, he is to take [from him by force] the mandya, and he is to send [it and] the staff to Moscow. And he is to write a report of that to the most holy patriarchs and to all the sacred synod. And the monk Nicon is not to be allowed to have any kind of influence in the affairs of the monastery, but he is to live in absolute retirement in his cell, receiving what is necessary for his support.' 'Such an instruction, under the hands of the most holy patriarchs, was sent *on the road after* the archimandrite this same date, at the fourth hour of the day, by the patriarchal sin-boyar Dmitri Vladimireff.'

(Dec. 14.) 'From the tsar &c., to Joseph &c.: When this our letter reaches thee, thou art to go with the monk Nicon, late patriarch of Moscow, to Bielozersk, to the Therapontoff monastery, by that road and by those towns by which orders have been given to convey him, with the blessing of the most holy patriarchs and of all the sacred synod, and according to the podorojna which is now sent to Aggæus Shepeleff, viz. by Dmitroff and Ouglich. Written at Moscow, A.M. 7175, Dec. 14.' 'Such another letter from the great hossoudar was delivered to Joachim archimandrite of the Choudoff monastery.'

'A.M. 7175, Dec. 15. Joseph, archimandrite of the Pechersky at Nijny, received minutes of instruction from the most holy œcumenical patriarchs and all the sacred synod under their hands, to go with the monk Nicon to the Therapontoff monastery, to Bielo-ozero. It was given through the patriarchal sin-boyar Dmitri Osipoff, son of Vladimir; and the archimandrite Joseph gave this acceptance.'

(Dec. 21 and 27.) 'To the superlatively all-holy œcumenical patriarchs Kyr Paisius &c. and Kyr Macarius &c., and to all the sacred synod, Joseph, archimandrite of the Pechersky at Nijny, makes his obeisance. In this year 7175, Dec. 13, ye, my lords, &c. did order me your beadsman to go with the monk Nicon, late patriarch of Moscow, to the Therapontoff monastery, &c. [as above, only instead of 'his archimandrite's mandya,' it is spoken of as 'the episcopal mandya,' and the order is distinct to take them both, both the mandya and the staff, from him in case he refuses to give them up]. And so, my lords, in this year 7175, Dec. 21, I arrived at the Therapontoff monastery; and he, the monk Nicon, gave up to me your beadsman the episcopal mandya and staff, according to your ukaz, without any manner of contention. And I your beadsman took from him the episcopal mandya and staff, and sent them to you the most holy œcumenical patriarchs, and to the sacred synod, to Moscow, by Barlaam an hieromonach of the same Therapontoff monastery, and the servitor Ivashka Krivozuboff.

'Moreover, with the same Nicon there came hither from Moscow two hieromonachs, Pamba and Palladius, and two hierodiacons, Isaiah and Marko, and one simple monk, Flavian, and two laics, Gerashko Matveyeff of the village of Zavidoff in the riding of Klinsk, and Hypatko Michaeloff of the village of Viatka in the riding of Yaroslaff. And the monk Nicon says that he wishes that those monks and laymen may be allowed to go freely, on foot or otherwise, whither they please, and that they may not be deprived of their liberty. But I your beadsman dare not without *your* permission give them their liberty, nor admit to him, Nicon, others who come to him. And about this I desire to have your orders.' (Dated 'A.M. 7175, Dec. 27.')

XIX.

At p. 199: Between 18th Dec. 1666 and 14th Jan. 1667, after the degradation of Nicon, but before the election of a new patriarch, the two Eastern patriarchs Paisius and Macarius wrote, or had written for them, and made their own, the following communications to their brethren the patriarchs Nectarius of Jerusalem and Parthenius of Constantinople.

I. *To the patriarch Nectarius of Jerusalem.*

Most holiest, most superlatively blessed, most adorned with wisdom, patriarch of Jerusalem and of all Palestine, Kyr Kyr Nectarius, our most beloved brother and most honourable fellow-minister in the Holy Ghost, we salute thee &c., praying &c. the Almighty &c. to give thee peace, *liberation from all debts*, health and strength, and exaltation of the holy and life-giving sepulchre, for our spiritual joy and gladness.

Be it known to thee that we set forth from our sees, *after having seen the writing* announcing that thy beatitude had the intention of journeying into these countries. And farther, *the bearer of the letter told us* by word of mouth that the œcumenical patriarch *intended to send his exarch:* so that we were hereby the more moved to journey hither, to the end that it might not happen that there should be made any change in all the heads which we *all* the four patriarchs had judged. Moreover, we saw also the codicil of thy superlative beatitude, that is, the short observation which thou didst separately write on the parchment after all our subscriptions, as if with a view to the condemnation of Nicon: and, *going in some degree upon this*, we have done as follows:

We summoned him to the synod, not once only but twice: and he came to give a full answer to all the accusations which were brought against him by many witnesses. Moreover, O most blessed brother, there were found also other special charges, which it is *not convenient to write*, because a letter cannot keep *a secret. Only this suffices*, that *there had been much and great inward pain caused for many years to the most worthy tsar*, who, as from a fountain, poured forth tears from his eyes, so as even to wet the floor of the room with them.

Again: we ascertained that the accusations made were *not* made *of passion*[17] nor of hatred. *For* to such an excess of swollen pride did Nicon go, that he constituted himself patriarch of a new Jerusalem. For he named a monastery which he was founding[18] New Jerusalem, with all its environs, naming these

[17] Yet a few lines farther on, Paisius of Gaza, or whoever else was employed by the Muscovites to prepare the first draft of this letter, put into it such *passionate* calumny, that they themselves, on second thoughts, have to draw the pen through their own words.

the Holy Sepulchre, Golgotha, Bethlehem, Nazareth, and Jordan.

Moreover, our arrival was in some sense a *liberation of thy messenger* (the bearer of thy letters) Sebastian, *whom scarcely we were able, by many entreaties and prayers, to get freed from the tsar's wrath and from confinement.* And *thence* we learned that it was in truth *temerity* for any one to judge without much examination and suitable investigation in a matter with which he is not perfectly acquainted.[19] Therefore, when we, after coming hither, had seen with our eyes, and, having carefully searched out all the truth, had found Nicon *not only unworthy to hold the patriarchal chair*, but, farther, *not to be worthy either of the episcopal rank, we, according to the holy and divine canons*, and according to *our patriarchal tome* [*i. e.* the written answers sent previously], have stript him of all power to do sacerdotal acts. And he *is sent* to a distinguished monastery, *that he may there weep for his sins.*

We make this notification for the special information of thy eminent holiness, as also it is fitting that we should thus notify what we do one to another, as the constitutions of the holy Church require.

But we, by the mercy and grace of God, and by the care and *beneficence* of *our* tsar, most worthy of many years, hope after the termination of this *divine* work, and likewise after the ordination of a new patriarch who shall be elected synodically, to return to our *most needy* chairs. But may God vouchsafe to us to meet again together, and to pray together at those holy places on which Christ our Lord trod with his feet; and may we all have joy, in body and in soul. Farewell, brother most beloved, both as to the outer and as to the inner man. The brethren of thy beatitude in all things and for all things [with the signatures of the two patriarchs].

[18] In the Slavonic copy of the synodal archives, either the translation of the *original Greek draft*, or itself the original which was to be translated into Greek, after 'founding' there follow these words, '*from robbery and sacrilege*,' but they have been *erased*, and do not appear in the Greek and Slavonic as printed in Roumantseff's *Collection, &c.*

[19] Alluding, as also a little above, to Nectarius' separate letter, and to the tsar's answer to it drawn up by Paisius Ligarides. See pp. 230 and 377. We have in this present letter manifest traces of the same hand.

[*Reasons appended to this letter or enclosed together with it.*]

1. Because he left the patriarchal chair, and *without finishing the liturgy* went out from the church.

2. In a letter to the œcumenical patriarch of C.P. he *wrote with wrath against the metropolitan of Gaza:* and of the religious tsar, and the sacred synod, and the boyars, and all the synclete, and all the orthodox Christians of the Russian empire, he wrote[20] as if they were heretics; as if they had separated themselves from the Eastern Church, and had united themselves to the Western Kostel, and so dishonoured the catholic orthodox church [the cathedral, that is, of the primacy], and the great prelates who rest in it.

3. When he was before the great hossoudar and before the *great judges* the holy œcumenical patriarchs, in answer to the questions of the great hossoudar and of all the synod, he said that it was on account of the tsar's anger that he left the church of God and the patriarchal chair; but that he did not say what he said as he was going out from it with any imprecation; but without any imprecation, he said: 'I leave the church of God and the patriarchal chair of my own will, for my own sins; and I will be no more patriarch.'

4. Moreover, he, the patriarch Nicon, said that he had foreseen and foretold, after his appointment to the patriarchal chair, that after six years he would be persecuted by the tsar. Why, if he knew that, did he for six years hold counsel with unrighteousness?

5. After he had left the church of God and the patriarchal chair, he subsequently wrote to the great hossoudar, in the past year 7166 [A.D. 1658], three letters, in which he wrote himself '*ex*-patriarch:' and in a fourth letter, which he wrote about the ceremony of Palm Sunday against the metropolitan Pitirim, saying that he had unlawfully and impiously adulterated the sacred seat of the great high-priest of all Russia, and had performed the ceremony of Palm Sunday without the counsel of the holy synod, he wrote of his own return to the patriarchal

[20] So he is deposed and degraded by these two patriarchs for writing a letter to their superior or elder brother the patriarch of C.P., the primate of their whole communion, on the evidence of that letter itself, intercepted and produced by the tsar. It is not enough to degrade Nicon at the bidding of the tsar, but they must also show how little they respect the patriarch of C.P., and how little they respect themselves.

chair these words: 'nor looking to a return, as a dog to his vomit, to any love of power and authority.'

6. And in a letter written about the election of another patriarch he wrote that 'if it were desired rightfully and canonically and religiously to elect a patriarch, his humility should be invited *in a friendly and courteous manner*,[21] and a beginning having been made, as of a religious act, synodically and piously, let the election be made: and then he whom the divine grace should choose to the great high-priesthood should receive his blessing.' All those letters were written in his, the patriarch Nicon's, own hand: and as regards the letter about the election and blessing of a patriarch to the patriarchate, that also is subscribed with his own hand.

II. *Letter to the patriarch of Constantinople.*

Most holiest, most wisest, and most divinely-elected Kyr N. œcumenical patriarch [*i.e.* patriarch of Constantinople], we, thy brethren in the Holy Ghost and fellow-ministers, salute with one accord thine eminent holiness, wishing all things salutary &c. to thee, together with all the rest of the sacred synod of the most wise bishops who are with thee in the capital city.

Be it known to your brotherly charity in the Lord (*for there is nothing secret that shall not be brought to light*,[22] and no one who doeth anything secretly seeks himself that this should be brought to light, according to the Lord's word in ch. vii. of St. John's gospel), that the most illustrious and divinely-crowned tsar &c. wrote to us not once only but twice, as we have learned that he wrote also to the other most holy Eastern chairs; and farther that he also sent a confidential messenger on that same account, desiring us to come and judge a certain ecclesiastical cause of his, which was pending in his orthodox empire, assuring us farther that there would be sent from your eminent holiness some one to represent the person of your patriarchate: and that for greater assurance of security against calamities, and for the consolation of souls, there was to be a certain particular condescension and economy, so that [for the

[21] 'So,' it is argued, 'we are justified by his own words for having in our own friendly and courteous way condemned and degraded him.'

[22] And so also the truth concerning this condemnation of the patriarch Nicon, their Greek verbosity prophesying unconsciously against itself.

future] two monarchies should be united into one [the Russian empire, that is, and the kingdom and grand duchy of Poland and Lithuania], so that the needless and pernicious discord and strife now existing between them might cease; a strife produced and kept up by certain bad men, who set the kingdoms at variance for their own interested purposes. Moreover, we had previously been assured that the most blessed patriarch of Jerusalem had been for a long time past half way advanced on his journey, so that he also might be personally present in the sacred synod to be held at Moscow. For this cause, we two patriarchs, that we might not seem to be at variance with so great a patriarchal unity, and that we might not seem to be disobedient to so urgent and so very reasonable a bidding of the tsar, went forth, and made a laborious journey, going through frozen regions and over inaccessible mountains, looking *only* to one end, viz. that of maintaining our ancestral faith and *true justice*. And all these hardships we accounted as nothing, though we were burdened with years and very unfit for a long journey. We went forth then. But when we had arrived at the aforesaid city of Moscow, we did not find there the presence [nor a representative] of your brotherly charity, as we had expected, and as had been promised us. And on that account we were much and heartily distressed to find ourselves frustrated of our hope, and destitute of that good fellowship. But since, according to the proverb, what is done cannot be undone, we proceeded to another consideration. And we began to examine that ecclesiastical cause, *which had also been already carefully sifted and judged by a local synod.*[23] And we found the ex-patriarch Nicon to be on very many counts a debtor, *i.e.* subject to punishment by the canons, and guilty;[24] and that he had *affronted* by his *writings our* most potent tsar: likewise that he had *scandalised* the most illustrious synclete, reviling it, and calling them heretics and latinisers. Also he kept the Church in widowhood for the space of nine years, quite deprived of all

[23] So they allow that synod as canonical, and substantially confirm and repeat its judgment.

[24] Here in the Slavonic, which again seems to be the original draft rather than the Greek, there follow these words: 'It is enough merely to say in brief that he had *disturbed* the *whole empire*.' But they have been *erased*. So the Jews accused Christ of 'stirring up the people;' and the apostles, saying, 'They that have turned the world upside down have come hither also.'

decent regularity and of the beauty of the patriarchate, tormenting it by his *rogueries* and his trickeries in all manner of ways. More especially, after an absolute abdication of the chair made by him publicly in the cathedral, he continued to celebrate and to ordain, doing all things belonging to the episcopal rank freely and unhindered, insulting at the same time holy things by certain new and vain titles of his own, calling himself, as if he had ordained himself, Patriarch of the New Jerusalem. But we consider it to be *superfluous* to *enumerate* his very numerous transgressions, *which can scarcely be counted.*

Again, we found, O most holy lord, the patriarchal chair of the capital city of Moscow very much afflicted and strangely dishonoured, and this great flock destitute of a watchful shepherd; so that we perceived it to be a truth, that the calling of us in by the most illustrious tsar on this account was an act very necessary, right, and canonical. And the judgment which the local synod of Moscow had [previously] pronounced *was perfectly correct, in all respects just*, and *framed according to the sacred canons*, and *confirmed* [afterwards] according to *our patriarchal tomes.* Therefore we exerted ourselves with all our strength (though we did all things with great deliberation and with very much investigation *on the part of the tsar*, most worthy of many years and our protector, and with the judgment *conscientiously* given before God by the local synod of bishops); and when we had made ourselves acquainted with the acts of Nicon, we found that he had not walked aright, but had gone out of the king's highway, the way of the mean, to the one side and to the other:[25] and we altogether deposed him *publicly*[26] in *the* church, and gave sentence synodically that he should live in one of the old monasteries which was *sufficiently well provided* and accessible, that he may there weep for his sins. In consequence the patriarchal chair is now in widowhood, until from on high the Most High shall find a worthy bridegroom specially elected by himself for his Church.

Moreover, *we have requested the tsar*, most worthy of many years, that there be made some synodical notification and expla-

[25] Here follow in the Slavonic these words, '*having indulged in robbery and sacrilege*,' which have been crossed out.

[26] This is false: it was done *privately*, in a chapel over the back gates of the Choudoff monastery.

nation, through messengers bearing letters from him about all that has been done here, to your eminent holiness. And *having received permission from him*, behold, we now with joy make this notification to you, *without any respect of persons*, speaking *all the truth*, in order that the future patriarch *may obtain his commemoration in the diptychs*. Moreover, we *anticipate* that *the usual alms* given [on the election of a patriarch of Moscow] to the great chair [of C.P.] and to the other *poor* patriarchal chairs will be now *repeated:* or rather that they will be something *more* and *more satisfactory* [than what is usual]. And about this we pledge ourselves and exert ourselves with all our might until it be done, that so the proverb may be fulfilled, which says, that 'when brother helps brother there shall be safety,' and that 'friends are useful in time of need.'[27]

We add also something else for our common consolation, viz. that by our coming hither the middle wall of enmity has been thrown down, and the pretext for daily captivity [for imprisoning Greeks at Moscow] has been done away; so that we may hope to come again to that former liberty of honour and glory which we had in old time. For here some, by their misconduct and madness, had dishonoured the super-eminent lustre of our race,[28] and thereby rendered themselves in the eyes of the grandees worthy of contempt and neglect. However, we have laboured, and every day we pray, that they may be cast out from the midst and altogether swept away and disgraced, for the sake of the general honour and good character of our race.

And we trust that so soon as we shall have completed that work, well-pleasing to God, which, with all our souls, we have begun *for the sake of the Catholic Church*, we may, by your holy prayers propitiating God, return to your parts [that is to C.P.], that we may salute one another with all our soul and heart, and converse together, always with due honour and becoming reverence; and after that, that we may go to our poor chairs, and see again the flock committed to us; as it is the duty of all of us who are named pastors to guard it thus with vigilance, that we may receive a worthy reward from Christ our chief pastor;

[27] The same proverb is quoted by Paisius of Gaza in writing to a Dominican father, P. Scieretsky, at Warsaw, in the same year, to engage him to obtain for him a pension from the Propaganda at Rome.

[28] See *Travels of Macarius*, pp. 64, 146, 147.

also that we may escape those terrible places of torment which shall be allotted to every one according to his works, and which await the workers of iniquity and pastors who have not been truly overseers, but dark men, who have not performed their duty of *zealous activity*.[29]

Farewell, both as to the outer and as to the inner man, O lord patriarch, planted by God and honoured by God, for very many years of health and safety, for the confirmation of the ecclesiastical firmament. The brethren of thy eminent holiness, yours in all things and for all things. (N.B. There is no date to this copy.)

XX.

At p. 204-207: 'Of the chronological reckoning of the years of the world, from the Creation to Christ.' And there is a question on the same subject in the *Travels of Macarius* (p. 74), with an allusion perhaps to its farther discussion afterwards, about Jan. 1st, A.D. 1667.

The patriarch Nicon, two centuries after his condemnation, has indirectly given occasion to a chronological discovery of importance, of which this may be a proper place to give some account. For the history of the synod of Moscow of 1666, having been written before Easter in 1667 by Paisius Ligarides, with the intention of so glorifying himself (as having been the chief actor in that affair), a copy of this history in the original Greek was carried away from Moscow to Egypt, either by the patriarch Paisius of Alexandria himself, on his return, or by some one of his company. The hopes indeed of Ligarides were disappointed: for his work was not taken up by the tsar Alexis, to whom it was dedicated, though in writing, in 1669, to the patriarch Dositheus of Jerusalem the tsar acknowledged that it was Ligarides who had done the work for them, and who had brought them, in their own sense, out of their difficulties: and in the Levant, though the other two patriarchs did not disavow what had been done, but made themselves parties to it from the first by their silence, and afterwards by their recognition of the new patriarchs of Moscow Joasaph, Pitirim, and Joachim, suc-

[29] *i.e.* that we as good pastors, worthily praised by ourselves, may escape the punishment of *slothful* pastors such as Nicon, rightly condemned by us and by the tsar for his want of *zealous activity*.

cessively created during Nicon's lifetime, and even in the letters obtained in 1683 by the tsar Theodore for the posthumous rehabilitation of Nicon, still both they, and the two patriarchs who had personally gone to Moscow 'for the sake of alms,' seem to have felt that the less that was said about it the better. And so Paul of Aleppo, the son and archdeacon of the patriarch Macarius of Antioch, when writing out, about 1670, and revising for publication his earlier travels in Muscovy, alludes only in one or two places briefly to their second journey thither, and that without entering into any details. And in Egypt the MS. history of Ligarides (branded only with two or three contemporary notes observing that the witnesses against Nicon were not 'trustworthy' but *un*trustworthy, and that Ligarides and his agent Meletius were forgers and liars) remained unread and unknown in the patriarchal library till it was discovered there by the Russian archimandrite Porphyrius, then stationed at Jerusalem. He translated some extracts from it—especially some of the strongest passages in the third book in favour of the secular supremacy—and sent them in the summer of 1851, with observations of his own written in the same spirit, to the Russian ambassador at Constantinople, who showed them to the present writer. It was thus that the existence of the History of Ligarides first came to his knowledge. After reading the extracts, he observed to the ambassador, that, for his own part, he hoped they might be published in Russia as the archimandrite expected, but he suspected that there would be people there sharp enough to see that adulation carried too far differs but little from irony, and is even more damaging to its object than serious opposition or invective. And so it was. The extracts translated and sent to Russia for publication in 1851 were never used; perhaps for the same reason for which the work itself was not translated nor published in 1667.

Having attempted in vain, by letters and through others, to get a transcript of Paisius' History made and sent to England, the writer went himself to Egypt in the autumn of 1853, in order to translate it from the original MS. But it was then no longer at Cairo. A Russian, M. Andrew N. Mouravieff, author of the *History of the Russian Church*, had similarly desired to obtain a copy of it; and the first book of the three of which it consists had actually been copied for him. But the Greek patriarch of

Alexandria, finding this copy to be very faulty, and being about to send a bishop to Russia for alms, sent the original MS. itself to M. Mouravieff, to be kept as long as wanted for use, and then returned. This ended, as perhaps the patriarch intended it should end, in the MS. being acquired, a year or two later, for the synodal library at Moscow. So for the time there was nothing else to be done but to translate the first book from that imperfect copy of it which was still at Cairo, and to obtain permission from the Greek patriarch to correct this and translate the rest from the MS. itself, whenever the applicant should go after it to Russia, which for the time the breaking out of the Crimean war had rendered impossible.

But though there was nothing more to be done then as regarded the MS., the accident of the writer having been brought by Nicon into Egypt, and having time there to think of other things besides translating, became the occasion, while he was still at Cairo, of his lighting upon a document connected with the date 305 B.C., preserved by Africanus and Syncellus, and called by them an Old Egyptian Chronicle, being in fact the oldest thing of the kind in the Greek language known in Egypt in the time of Africanus. The analysis and study of this Chronicle, and of other later documents or remains of lost works connected with it, as also of the monuments and of the fragments of a papyrus of the date B.C. 1209, preserved at Turin, begun in Egypt in 1854 and continued elsewhere till the summer of 1859, led to the ascertainment of the following results:

I. That the old Egyptians reckoned of *human* time from Apr. 26 in B.C. 5361, 4042 of their own vague years, equivalent to 4039 anticipated Julian years and 85 days, to July 20 in B.C. 1322, or 5503 vague years, equivalent to 5499 fixed and 85 days, to July 20 in A.D. 139. This reckoning, preserved in seven different documents (connected with the dates B.C. 1322, 332, 305, 268, 226, 100, and A.D. 412 respectively), was divided in the earliest exhibition of it into two parts, after the first 2264 vague or 2262 fixed years, by an epoch only six years after the flood, which so might easily be mistaken for it, but representing more probably the birth of Mizraim the first postdiluvian ancestor: for the flood was ignored by the early Egyptians.

II. That the Babylonians, as represented by Berosus, had a reckoning differing by only one year from that of the Egyptians

(for Berosus *seems* to have one year more), beginning from Apr. 26 in B.C. 5362 instead of 5361. But in truth the traditional reckoning both of the Egyptians and the Babylonians alike began from about the autumnal equinox in B.C. 5362; only the Egyptians cut off, while the Babylonians prefixed, some odd months in order to make their respective reckonings begin with the vague year (beginning in B.C. 5362 and 5361 from Apr. 26), and to consist from first to last of whole vague years. The Babylonian reckoning was divided into two parts by the epoch of the flood, which Berosus mentions with much detail, after the first 2258 vague or 2256 fixed (current) years.

III. That the Indians of the time of Seleucus Nicator had a reckoning (recoverable from Megasthenes, Arrian, Pliny, and others) of 5042 years to the death of Alexander, 13 Nov. B.C. 324, identical with that of Berosus, and divided, like it, into two parts by the epoch of the flood after the first 2258 vague years.

IV. That if any one, starting with any chronological system he pleases, will only consent to sacrifice provisionally its *peculiarities*, on whatever points the greater number and the greater antiquity of testimonies is against it, he will thus obtain from Hebrew and Christian sources a sacred reckoning of human time either absolutely identical with that of the Egyptians, the Babylonians, and the Indians above mentioned, or differing from it only to some very slight extent.

Thus in the present writer's work, entitled *Egyptian Chronicles*, published in London in A.D. 1860 (to which the reader who desires to study this subject is referred), the principle of compromise and of sacrificing peculiarities being applied to the sacred reckonings of the Septuagint and of Josephus gave the following result: To the flood (230 + 205 + 190 + 170 + 165 + 162 + 165 + 187 + 188 + 600 =) 2262 years (as if the whole reckoning were divided into two parts at the same epoch with that of the earliest hieratic scheme of the Egyptians), then 6 months to the birth of Arphaxad (in the second year after the *beginning* of the flood) + 135 + 130 + 134 + 130 + 132 + 130 (*without* the second Cainan) to the birth of Nahor + 79 to that of Terah + 70 to that of Abraham + 75 to the call of Abraham from Haran + 430 to the Exodus, making in all 3707 years and 6 months from about the autumnal equinox in B.C. 5362 to the Exodus in the spring of B.C. 1654; thence 46 years of Moses +

5 of the wars of Joshua + 20 of Joshua from the division of lands + 10 of the elders who outlived Joshua + 450 of servitudes and judges (including at the end 40 of Samson in the days of the Philistines, 40 of Eli, and 20 of the abode of the ark at Kiriath Jearim during Samuel's minority) till Samuel the prophet (*i.e.* till the judgeship of Samuel) + 32 of Samuel + 20 of Saul before Samuel withdrew from him + 490 of neglect of the Sabbatical years to Nisan 1 of the year[29] in which the temple was burned B.C. 587 + 70 of desolation to B.C. 517 + 187 of Persians + 329 of Greeks and Romans to Nisan 1 in B.C. 1 + 139 to Nisan 1 in A.D. 139, making in all 4499 years and 6 months, in exact agreement with all the three heathen reckonings. Nor can any one vary much from this result, so long as he adheres to that provisional basis of compromise which has been above suggested.

But if any one, not content with this, demands the exhibition of some reckoning which will stand the test of examination and criticism in every point of its details, that which the present writer thinks capable of being so tested, and which he adopts for himself, is as follows: first 2256 years (not 2262, Lamech having 182 not 188 to the birth of Noah) to the *end* of the flood: then 1 + 6 months to the birth of Arphaxad + 791 as before to the birth of Nahor + 29 *only* of Nahor to the birth of Terah + 70 of Terah to the birth of Haran, but 130 to that of Abraham + 70 of Abraham, not to the call from Haran but to the *first* call from Ur of the Chaldees + 430 to the Exodus; and thence on as before, making the same sum of years as was obtained by that other method of compromise, on which all may be invited to agree, at least provisionally; while it is hopeless, in that state of confusion and uncertainty to which chronological reckonings have been brought, to expect people to listen to any one who insists, whether with or without reason, on any reckoning of his own.

This is a posthumous contribution from the patriarch Nicon (who in his lifetime also compiled a voluminous Russian Chronicle) towards the enlightenment of his own people and of others; though English certainly is not the language through which any such contribution to learning ought now to be given to the world, unless it be the interest of some influential publisher to recommend it to the public as his own speculation.

[29] Or from acc. of Saul 120 + 372 to Daniel's captivity + (18 + 52 =) 70 + 205, &c. Or again 120 + 256 + 134 + 49 + 208, &c.

XXI.

At p. 279-284: 'Consecration of the new patriarch of Moscow, Joasaph.' In connection with this we insert the Letter given to this new patriarch on his consecration by the two œcumenical patriarchs, Paisius of Alexandria and Macarius of Antioch, with all the other bishops who joined in that act of consecration (one of these being *Paisius Ligarides*, and another *Athanasius the metropolitan of Iconium*).

By the permission of God &c., and by the command of the tsar Alexis Michaelovich &c., we, the humble Paisius, by the mercy of God patriarch of Alexandria &c., and the humble Macarius patriarch of Antioch &c., came to Moscow &c., the capital of the Christian Russian empire: and there came with us to the same city Philotheus archbishop of Trebizond, and Anastasius archbishop of Sinai, in the year of the world 7175, A.D. 1666, Nov. —, for the following cause:[30]

Whereas in A.M. 7166, July 10, the former pastor of the capital city of Moscow, and patriarch of all Great, *Little*, and *White* Russia, Nicon, of his own will left his patriarchal chair, and renounced the patriarchal authority, and set the pastoral staff at the patriarchal place, and went away to the monastery of the Resurrection of his own foundation, desiring to live a retired and quiet and peaceful life; and the most religious and most serene hossoudar the tsar, through his boyars and okolniks, and the most reverend the bishops of the great Russian empire with their own lips, and all the sacred synod, and a multitude of the people, besought him much at that time, and sought to force him to continue to preside in his patriarchal chair;[31] but he replied to them saying: I will not any longer feed but will be fed, and will attend only to myself; as is clear from the synodal act

[30] The absence of the date seems to show that this is either the original draft from which the document itself was to be transcribed, or a copy made from the document itself afterwards.

[31] The tsar perhaps did not even read—at any rate he returned as waste paper —the written communication sent to him by Nicon; sent him messages by his enemies, and desired him to stay, not as a spiritual father, but as a submissive slave: also when the *people* were sincerely seeking to force Nicon to stay, shutting the doors of the church and the gates of the Kremlin, the tsar and the boyars sent to *force them* to let him go; and when once he was gone, the guards at the city-gates had orders (at least after A.D. 1659) not to let him come back again.

written by the Russian bishops and by all the sacred synod before we came to Moscow:

And whereas, besides this his verbal renunciation, he sent also a writing, subscribed with his own hand, to the tsar &c. in the year 7173, Jan. — (A.D. 1665), proposing that the religious hossoudar &c. and the sacred synod should elect another, whom they pleased, and appoint him to be patriarch, and that he, Nicon, should not name himself nor be named patriarch of Moscow and all Russia:

We, by the mercy of God the most preëminently holy patriarchs, Paisius of Alexandria and Macarius of Antioch, with all the synod of the Russian empire, and with the Greek bishops who have come hither either with us or before us, have many times read and considered that synodal act above mentioned, and the writing of the *ex*-patriarch Nicon subscribed with his own hand; and we have found in addition certain divine canons of the holy fathers which are to the point, viz. canon xii. [ii.] of the synod held in St. Sophia, which says: 'Let not a bishop put himself down to the place of penitents; but if he has put himself down, he is not any more to lay claim to the episcopal honour;' and canon xvi. of the First and Second council, which says: 'Let not a bishop, under any pretence whatever, be ordained to a church, the president of which still lives and enjoys his honour, unless first he of himself renounces the episcopate; for it is necessary that the bishop be first after trial canonically deposed, and so another appointed in his stead,' &c. And canon xxv. of the Fourth œcumenical council commands that a church is not to remain in widowhood more than three months, but within that time a bishop is to be ordained. But the divinely-elected bride, the orthodox Church of Moscow, the capital of Great Russia, after the abandonment of the chair by the late patriarch Nicon, has now remained without a patriarch not three months only but eight years and seven months. And during those years she has suffered many assaults from the devil, and attacks, disturbances, and agitations about certain doctrines through men undisciplined in the sacred Scriptures, not only of the laity but also of the clergy.

Wherefore we judged, in common with all the bishops who are now here present at Moscow &c., in accordance with the above-mentioned divine canons, that the great church of the pa-

triarchate of Great Russia shall no longer remain in widowhood, but that a godly man, given to the continual study of the law of the Lord, shall be canonically elected to the supereminent (now widowed) patriarchal chair &c., in the room of the ex-patriarch Nicon, who renounced the patriarchate; that a good shepherd, capable of feeding well the rational sheep of Christ, shall be canonically elected, and ordained, and raised to the patriarchal chair; because, according to the above-cited canon of the Fourth œcumenical council, he who neglects within the time mentioned to ordain a bishop is deposed.

And so, with the counsel and command of the most illustrious high-throned hossoudar the tsar, I Paisius &c. and I Macarius &c., having the consent of the bishops of the Great Russian empire, and of the most reverend the Greek bishops who are here, viz. Pitirim metropolitan of Great Novgorod and Veliko-Loutsk, Laurentius metropolitan of Kazan and Sviajsk, Jonah of Rostoff and Yaroslaff, Paul of Sarai and Podonsk, *Paisius of Gaza*, Theodosius of Servia, Gregory of Nicæa, Cosmas of Amasia, *Athanasius*[32] *of Iconium*, Philotheus of Trebizond, Daniel of Varna, Simon archbishop of Vologda and Bielo-ozero, Philaret of Smolensk and Dorogoboujsk, Hilarion of Riazan and Mourom, Joasaph of Tver and Kashina, Joseph of Astrachan and Terek, Arsenius of Pskoff and Izborsk, Anastasius of Sinai, Alexander bishop of Viatka and Veliko-Perm, *Methodius of Mstislaff and Orsha*, Lazarus of Chernigoff, and Joachim a bishop of Servia, canonically elected a man worthy and righteous, without malice, wise, holy, and god-loving, full of all understanding, who has lived many years in the practice of monastic virtues, and has gone through the steps of the priesthood regularly, viz. Joasaph archimandrite of the glorious and great and preëminent Lavra which ranks the first in the Great Russian empire, the Lavra of the Blessed Trinity and of the venerable Sergius and Nicon the wonder-workers of Radonege,—a man capable of feeding the flock

[32] Either, then, if Athanasius was originally an honest though indiscreet man, whose judgment and conscience sided with Nicon, the tsar had so wrought by oppression upon his weakness, or by interest on his poverty, as to get him to act against his conscience; or, if he was really a knave such as he is described in the letter obtained at C.P. by Paisius Ligarides, what is to be thought of those who, after having been at the pains of sending to Constantinople to obtain testimony of his being a rogue, use him, and associate him with themselves and (blasphemously) also with 'the Holy Ghost,' for the condemnation of Nicon! See above, p. 82-92, 356-360, 363, 366, 369.

of Christ which he purchased with his own blood, and of steering well the ship of the orthodox Church of Great Russia by the straight helm of evangelical doctrine,—and with great importunity called on him.

Then, by the grace of the all-holy and life-giving Spirit given to us, we all of us together ordained him to the primacy, to be patriarch of Moscow &c., and raised him to the widowed chair of the patriarchate of the Russian catholic great church of our most holy Lady the Mother of God and ever-virgin Mary, of her venerable Assumption, and of the most reverend primates Peter, Alexis, Jonah, and Philip, the wonder-workers, metropolitans of all Russia, in the room of the late patriarch Nicon.

On this account now the new Israel rejoices, as being committed to a new Aaron, to be governed in *meekness*: the divinely-elected bride is glad, who has been till now many years in widowhood: the orthodox Church of Russia, having put off the mourning of her widowhood, and having clothed herself with the attire of gladness, has been given in spiritual marriage to a wise bridegroom: the rational sheep of Christ clap their hands, that now they shall be fed with the healthful food of the word of God by a good pastor: the divinely-built ark of the Russian Church is filled with great consolation, because it is to be steered by a divinely-wise Noah with the straight helm of spiritual direction: the whole choir of the orthodox children, spiritually born of the orthodox mother the Catholic Russian Church, sings with joy, because they have now given to them a loving father in the most holy Joasaph patriarch of Moscow and all Russia &c., for whom, for his praiseworthy and blameless life, the god-crowned religious and christ-loving hossoudar the tsar and grand prince Alexis Michaelovich, &c. himself with his imperial synclete gave his divinely-wise and special *permission*, knowing him to have known from a child the holy scriptures, which are able to make a man wise unto salvation, and to be capable of teaching others, so as to instruct them that are disorderly, to comfort the weak-hearted, to support the feeble, to be patient towards all, and to present each man perfect in Christ Jesus.

And so he, our brother and fellow-minister, the great hospodin the most holy Joasaph, patriarch of Moscow and all Russia &c., has now for his duty to keep that flock which he has received from God in piety and virtuous living, and rightly to

direct the word of truth: also, always to be zealous for the good government of the holy Orthodox Catholic and Apostolic Church, her good order and good condition, according to the tradition of the holy apostles and the holy fathers, according to the order of the holy Eastern Church, in all things, with agreement and union and due order, and without any change in anything, in all his patriarchate, and to keep entirely uninfringed, to the best of his ability, as is the duty of patriarchs, the evangelical and apostolical and patristic ecclesiastical traditions, and the sacred canons; and, as an orderly distributer of orders, to ordain canonically readers and subdeacons, deacons, protodeacons, archdeacons, priests, protopopes, hegoumens, archimandrites, bishops, archbishops, and metropolitans; also to pray to God for the orthodox tsar, and for all the christ-loving people (πλήρωμα), according to the injunction of St. Paul, who says: 'I exhort, therefore, that first of all supplications, prayers, intercessions, and giving of thanks be made for all men; for kings, and all that are in authority; that we may lead a quiet and peaceable life in all godliness and honesty' (1 Tim. ii. 1, 2). For the prayers of the clergy are like anchors, holding fast the imperial dominion, and subjecting to it the barbarous tribes of the heathen. Also it is his duty to teach the orthodox people the Christian law and good living, and to bring back them that have erred into the way of truth. And all the heretics it is his duty, so far as possible, to convert to orthodoxy and to the unity of the Church; and the unbelievers by his bright and striking acts to attract and make to be imitators of the faith. For a patriarch is a living image of Christ, by acts and words imaging in himself the truth. And he must be apt to teach towards all alike, high and low, being gentle in his instructions, not as lording it over the clergy, but as being an example to the flock. But as regards them that are disobedient, he ought to be capable of refuting and rebuking them in season and out of season. And in behalf of truth and piety, and for the observance of justice, he should be ready to *speak before kings without being ashamed*, and, as a good shepherd, *even to lay down his life for the flock*.[33]

But ye who are our sons in Christ, illuminated by the bright beams of saving orthodoxy, most reverend bishops, noble boyars and princes, venerable archimandrites and hegoumens, and all

[33] See *Replies of Nicon*, p. 64, and above, p. 175.

the sacred order, and all orthodox people of this patriarchate! give all of you to him who is our brother and fellow-minister and your father, the great hospodin the most holy Joasaph patriarch of Moscow &c., honour as to your lord and father and arch-pastor, in like manner as ye did to the former patriarchs; knowing that whatever honour any one gives to the bishop he gives it to *Christ* himself. For the honour of the bishop passes to Christ himself,[34] according to those words: 'Them that honour me I will honour, and he that lightly regards me shall be lightly regarded.'[35] And again: 'He that receiveth a prophet in the name of a prophet shall receive a prophet's reward, and he that receiveth a righteous man in the name of a righteous man shall receive a righteous man's reward; and whosoever shall give to drink unto one of these little ones a cup of cold water only in the name of a disciple, verily I say unto you he shall not lose his reward' (Matt. x. 40, 42). Submit yourselves, then, to him, and be obedient, according to the divine apostle, who says: 'Obey them that have the rule over you, and submit yourselves: for they watch for your souls as they that must give account, that they may do it with joy and not with grief: for that is not profitable for you' (Heb. xiii. 17). For he has the power given from Christ to the holy apostles to bind and to loose; and whomsoever he shall bind on earth, he shall be bound in heaven, and whomsoever he shall loose on earth, he shall be loosed in heaven. Therefore obey him, all of you, in all things, *even as Christ himself*, according to the evangelical instruction contained in those words which he spake to his holy disciples, saying: 'He that heareth you heareth me,'[36] &c.; and again: 'He that refuseth me and heareth not my words, hath one that judgeth him: the word that I have spoken, the same shall judge him in the last day.' Therefore, as shepherds feed with the staff the sheep which follow them, but correct with the staff them that stray,

[34] So Nicon used to tell them; but after his condemnation it should be rather 'he that honours the bishop honours the *tsar* himself.'

[35] 'Lightly regarded' they have indeed been since; as those must know who have read accounts of the buffooneries publicly enacted by more than one of the successors of Alexis; buffooneries in comparison with which that of the boyar Streshneff and his dog was the merest trifle.

[36] So said Nicon. But, after the tsar had set all an example of *disobeying* him, to inculcate *obedience* in these terms to a successor substituted by the tsar and the boyars only that, unlike Nicon, *he* might *obey them*, is hypocrisy, or rather absolute nonsense.

and give them blows, and drive away the wolves from the flock, so for this cause the bishops also hold the δικανίκιον, after the likeness of the pastoral staff of Moses. For the prototypes of the spiritual shepherds of the Church were not fierce and barbarous men, but chosen men, meek and just, as Abel, Jacob, Moses, and David. Therefore also there appeared to them [*i.e.* to the shepherds at Bethlehem] the angel of the Lord, as to men sanctified, and made to be types of bishops. So shall the most holy patriarch Joasaph with the staff of spiritual direction feed them that submit themselves to him and follow him; but them that do not submit themselves to him nor follow him, with the staff of spiritual discipline he shall *smite, wound, and break as potters' vessels.* And as for them that oppose themselves and cause scandal to the flock of Christ as pertinacious wolves, let him with a sling, by the power given him of Christ, expel them from the fold of Christ, that they may not seize, tear, and destroy the gentle sheep; but may all together, that is, the sheep that are fed with their shepherds, by the almighty help of the chief pastor, Christ our God, be brought into the heavenly sheepfold, there to dwell and to find the unwithering pasturage of eternal bliss. And to the good pastor, who has been ready to lay down his life for the sheep, may it be vouchsafed together with them to stand before Christ our God, who is the Lamb without spot: and may he be able to say with boldness, 'Lord, behold, I and my children.' May he hear those words: 'Well done, good and faithful servant; thou hast been faithful in a few things, I will set thee over many things: enter thou into the joy of thy Lord.' And may he be vouchsafed, with all committed to him, to receive [those good things] which eye hath not seen nor ear heard, nor hath it entered into the heart of man to conceive, which God hath prepared for them that love him; into which things the angels desire to look.

And to this end there is given to him our brother and fellow-minister, the great hospodin the most holy Joasaph patriarch of Moscow and all Russia, this our Letter of institution to the chair, for his establishment in the imperial city of Moscow &c. in the house of our most holy Lady &c. and of the great wonder-workers &c. And this our present letter we, the most holy patriarchs, with all the bishops of Great Russia and the Greek bishops [now present at Moscow], having subscribed it with our

hands, and having affixed to it our seals, have delivered to him the great hospodin, the most holy Joasaph patriarch &c. in the year of the world 7175, A.D. 1667, May —, in the fifth year of the Indiction [the consecration having been on the 10th Feb. preceding].

II. (From the synodal archives, Feb. 28, A.D. 1667.) 'The blessing of the great hospodin the most holy Joasaph patriarch of Moscow &c. to our beadsman the monk Leontius Zernoff kellar of the Troitsa monastery of St. Sergius, to Cyprian Simonofsky the treasurer, and to the collegiate elders. In this year 7175, Feb. 28,[37] the great hossoudar &c. made order to send *from the Troitsa* monastery of St. Sergius Joseph, sometime archimandrite of the *Novospass*, to Bielo-ozero, to the Therapontoff monastery, to take the place of Joseph archimandrite of the Pechersky at Nijny. And so soon as this letter reaches you, you are to send &c. [as above]. And on the day on which you send him you are to write and send a report thereof to us, and order it to be delivered in our razriad to Elias Kouzmich Bezobraztsoff, and to our secretary Ivan Kalitin. Written at Moscow A.M. 7175, Feb. 28.' 'Such a letter Ivashko Miteyeff servitor from the Pechersky monastery at Nijny received, and has set to his hand.'

(March 3.) 'From the great hospodin the most holy Joasaph &c. to Joseph archimandrite of the Pechersky of Nijny, at the Therapontoff monastery on the Bielo-ozero [about his being replaced by the other Joseph sometime archimandrite of the Novospass, and ordering him, on the arrival of the other, to come to Moscow, and present himself 'in our razriad' before Bezobraztsoff and Kalitin: dated A.M. 7175, March 3]. 'Such a letter he received from Ivashko Miteyeff servitor of the Pechersky at Nijny, and he has set to his hand.'

'A.M. 7175, March —, by *ukaz* of the great *hossoudar* the tsar &c. and by *prikaz* of the great *hospodin* the most holy Joasaph patriarch of Moscow &c. an order was made that Joseph, sometime archimandrite of the Novospass, is to [go to replace Joseph archimandrite of the Pechersky at Nijny to the Therapontoff monastery on the Bielo-ozero]; and that from the time

[37] This was, in 1667, Thursday in the first week of Lent, the 18th day after the consecration of Joasaph, who before had been the archimandrite at Troitsa.

of his arrival there he is to be with the monk Nicon, late patriarch of Moscow, till farther order. And he is to take care that he, the monk Nicon, writes no letters nor sends any whither; and he is to keep strict guard that no man do any hurt or insult to the same Nicon; and that the said Nicon is to have no sort of control over the affairs of the monastery; but food and all manner of quiet in his cell is to be provided for him according to his needs. To this order and instruction the seal of our great hospodin the most holy Joasaph &c. is affixed.' 'Such a note the elder N. received from Ivashka Miteyeff servitor of the Pechersky at Nijny, and he has set to his hand.'

XXII.

(In connection with p. 114, 117: and with what Nicon objects at p. 430.) Letter from the tsar Alexis Michaelovich to the œcumenical patriarch of C.P. Parthenius, written seemingly in the spring of A.D. 1667, to engage him to obtain the restoration of the patriarchs Paisius of Alexandria and Macarius of Antioch to their chairs, which, in consequence of their having absented themselves without permission of the civil (the Turkish) rulers, had been filled as vacant, and were now occupied by others.

We, Alexis Mich. &c., by the mercy of God great hossoudar, tsar, and grand prince, autocrat of all Great, Little, and White Russia &c., to the most holy and most blessed Kyr Parthenius, by the mercy of God archbishop of Constantinople, New Rome, and œcumenical patriarch:

'Other foundation can no man lay than that which is laid, which is Christ Jesus,' according to the ever-memorable words of St. Paul, O most honourable father and wise arch-pastor: but on that immovable foundation, as thy entire beatitude knows, the solid walls of the most holy and undefiled faith, the life-bearing foundation itself nourishing them, hold together unshaken, so that even the gates of hell prevail nothing, nor shall prevail. For how can the malice of the weak brushwood of the immaterial fire affect that adamantine foundation? On which glorious and impregnable fortress there stand as four noble walls the four most holy œcumenical patriarchs, adorning the place of the apostles, of whom the chief is thy most honourable high-priesthood, ever on the above-mentioned glorious foundation in

the edifice of our holy Mother the Church, building up good things and things profitable to all the faithful. For this conspicuous and very great edification of the Church by thy pontifical merit we rejoice and exult together with her, having heard that one so exceedingly worthy of honour as your all-blessedness adorns so suitably and worthily the most honourable chair of the successors of the apostles.

For this cause, by this present letter of our imperial majesty, we make known to your most holy entire beatitude that thy most blessed and most holy brethren, who oversee with their archieratical eye the holy thrones in the East, the œcumenical patriarchs Paisius of Alexandria and Macarius of Antioch, being pressed and overborne by temporary difficulties to the occurrence of which the common nature of man is liable, had found it necessary to undertake a journey to different countries and cities *in quest of alms*, and for the making up of what was lacking; for great is the sharpness of want, *and it makes even them that are very wise to be beggars*. And *while* those most honourable pontiffs thy brethren *were travelling to collect alms*, there reached our imperial ears *a report of this travelling* of such holy and honourable men, *especially when they visited places in countries nearly adjacent to our imperial dominions*. And *hereupon, as* their most honourable entire beatitudes *were travelling near* the dominions of our imperial majesty in other countries *for the collection of alms*, we sent to them our imperial letters, as to leaders of our holy faith who were dear to us, being moved hereto by the fervour of holy orthodoxy, that, *as* they were visiting such distant places, those men, holding such exalted chairs, would *also for the collection of what they needed*[38] come to our dominions. And they, *as fulfillers of the sacred commands*, did not neglect our proposal, but came to the capital city of Moscow, the seat of our empire, *for the sake of the above-mentioned alms:* whom we have received very affectionately, even as the holy princes of the apostles Peter and Paul; and we honour them even as vicars of

[38] Thus dissembling altogether the true motive for *soliciting* them to come, which seems strange, when it was asserted at Moscow that they came to *judge Nicon* with the knowledge and consent of the other two patriarchs, and that they had full authority to act for them in this trial. But this assertion, as it seems, meant only that the answers or tomes sent previously in 1664 had been subscribed by all the four patriarchs who were then sitting.

the most honourable thrones of the divine ever-memorable evangelists Mark and Luke.

But by the divine decree of the most high Lord and Ruler of the universe, *at the time of their coming*, and during their present stay in our empire, there occurred in the holy Russian Church certain grave matters, which needed the common counsel and judgment of two such most honourable and most blessed pontiffs thy brethren. And this counsel and judgment in truth their divinely-inspired lips supplied to us.

Moreover, we were wonderfully gratified by their holy and angelical conversation, and by their spiritual wisdom, and we satiated ourselves with the sweet words of their sacred zeal and meekness.

But our imperial ears have been pained by certain rumours that, instead of the above-mentioned thy most honourable brethren, so highly worthy of their pontifical chairs, *two others have* —God knows by whom—*been appointed patriarchs.*

We desire therefore, and we offer this our counsel to thy most honourable entire beatitude in accordance with the sacred constitutions of the holy fathers, that thou wouldest extend to the above-mentioned most holy pontiffs thy brethren, now sojourning in the dominions of our imperial majesty, the hand of brotherhood, the hand of help. For great sadness and compassion takes possession of our heart to think that two such great luminaries of the Church, passing this present life in the journeyings of a sorrowful pilgrimage, have to *abide* in foreign lands during the days of this present time. So do thou, O most honourable father and most blessed arch-pastor, help for the love of God these bishops and most blessed hierarchs, thy brethren; that brethren, being according to the command of the supreme Lord helped by brethren, may be as a strong city; and so, in that heavenly city which is above, the reward of thy brotherly love may be multiplied abundantly; and that they, the most honourable hierarchs thy brethren above mentioned, may regain their episcopal places, and many others, seeing them *contending in behalf of unsullied justice*, may be edified *to the fulfilment of justice.*

God and the Lord Jesus Christ our Saviour, the foundation of all *justice*, grant to thy most blessed and most worshipful high-priesthood in this life that double health which Christians desire,

and in the world to come joy and glory among the holy orders of the angels. Moreover, we entreat your entire beatitude charitably to pray for us and for our imperial dominions.

Written in the imperial court of our sovereignty, in the capital city of Moscow, in the year from the Incarnation of God the Word [1667].

XXIII.

At p. 288-295. Of the final settlement of the question whether proselytes from the Latins are to be baptised or only chrismed. This portion of the acts of the synod of Moscow, of the date of 15th March 1667, has been printed at full from the synodal archives in the volume entitled *Dissertations on the Orthodox Communion* (London, Masters, 1853), where the reader will find also notices of the decrees of two synods held by Nicon in 1655 and 1656 on the same subject, and a later Answer, sent in 1718 to Peter the Great, from the patriarch of C.P. Jeremiah III., extending the same rule to the baptisms of the Lutherans and Calvinists, p. 188-197. See also *Travels of Macarius*, p. 174, 321; and p. 265 of Paisius' *History of the Synod of* 1666, *&c.*

XXIV.

(Referring to p. 284, 288, 296, and 299.) Besides the deposition of Nicon, and the appointment of another patriarch of Moscow in his stead, there were also other matters which needed to be settled with as great a show of ecclesiastical authority as possible, and the settlement of which had been a joint motive for bringing two at least of the four patriarchs together with other Eastern bishops to Moscow. To these matters Paisius Ligarides alludes (at p. 288) when he writes that, a few days before the 10th March 1667, 'the emperor came to the two patriarchs, with the chief boyars and the patriarch of Moscow and all the bishops, and proposed to them *certain heads*, the most important of which by far was the question whether the Latins ought to be rebaptised.' This question, which had been already synodically decided in 1655 and 1656, and with the assistance of the patriarch Macarius of Antioch, was in fact, in March 1667, returned to and treated over again; and the like was done by other synodical acts of Nicon, which it was not intended to

reverse, lest their authority should seem to be impaired by his condemnation. But Paisius gives a false impression when he singles out the question of Latin baptism, and treats it alone at length, whereas other acts of the synod, on points less important in themselves, but connected with the schism of the Starobratsi, ought rather to have been put forward; that respecting Latin baptisms being mentioned only in its place as one chapter among the rest. Elsewhere indeed (at p. 296) he does allude to one other of the acts of the synod, viz. that concerning the erection of fresh sees in Russia, and the power of the emperor to raise sees to a higher rank; and at p. 299 he promises to *append* the 'synodical constitution itself' below. But this promise, like another earlier one (at p. 74) relating to the xxx. Questions of Streshneff and his own Answers, he has not fulfilled. It remains then for us to do it for him now.

The acts indeed of the synod of Moscow, as decreed during the first half of A.D. 1667, and preserved in the archives of the patriarchate, if printed at full, would form a volume of themselves, and one extraneous to the scope of our present work. Still, they are so connected, all of them indirectly and many parts of them also directly, with the double conflict engaged in by Nicon, both against popular superstition and against state supremacy in religion, that some account of them is necessary to our purpose. We will therefore give here two lists of them; the first making xi. chapters (which is the true number), and indicating the subsections of each chapter; the other seeming to make xii. chapters, and describing only the chapters themselves. Some of the chapters, but not all of them, in the original acts give their own dates; and from these it appears that neither in the one *list* nor in the other are they enumerated in their chronological order; but each list seems to represent only that order or disorder in which the eleven separate documents were found following one another when that list was made. Together with the first and fuller list, which indicates the subsections, there are added some farther notices, and extracts from the full text of the original chapters themselves, wherever such additions seemed desirable.

List of the Chapters, with their subsections.

'The book of the synodal acts concerning various matters and necessary ecclesiastical questions in the form of Questions and

Answers, which were asked and decided under the tsar Alexis Michaelovich &c. in his imperial presence, and in the presence of the most holy patriarchs Paisius &c., Macarius &c., and Joasaph &c., and of many Greek bishops, and of all the Russian metropolitans and archbishops and bishops and archimandrites and hegoumens, and all the sacred synod, and which are subscribed by their hands.

CHAPTER I.

i. Why in A.M. 7175 [7173, A.D. 1666-1667 ?] a synod was assembled in Moscow; and in particular: Of the four-ended cross on the prosphoræ or oblations; of the Creed; and of the Alleluias; how ignorant persons have been scandalised; and how these things are attested; and of the newly-corrected books: also of the sense of the cross, a synodal exposition and injunction: of the Prayer to Jesus, how to say it together with others, and alone: and how to make the seal on prosphoræ: how a priest is to put the fingers together in blessing. Such as will not obey, but oppose themselves, are anathematised.

ii. Concerning certain decisions made in the synod called the Stoglav [or synod of the hundred chapters] held under John IV. Basilievich, by Macarius metropolitan of Moscow, in A.D. 1551.

iii. That in the life of St. Euphrosynus of Polotsk what is written of the *double* Alleluia is not to be believed.

iv. What bodies of deceased persons remain uncorrupt? for what cause? and how to attest them?

Extracts from the original document, and observations.

(From i.) 'We command all orthodox Christians of all orders, both small and great, men and women, to submit in all things, without any kind of doubt or gainsaying, to the holy *Eastern* and Apostolic Church of Christ.'

(From ii.) The synod held under John IV. Basilievich and the metropolitan Macarius is abrogated, and its anathema is disallowed. 'Grace &c. and our benediction,' it is said, 'be on those that obey the holy *Eastern* and Apostolic Church, and on those that obey *us*, now and ever, and world without end. Amen.'

Note that ii. iii. and iv. are attached as an *appendix*; and the signatures of the three patriarchs and other bishops cover the tops and the bottoms of all the leaves; and only those of

twelve archimandrites and hegoumens, who remained still to sign, follow in order after the appendix.

CHAPTER II.

[Chapter ii. in the original document has a heading thus: 'Canons which were proposed for enactment to the sacred synod by the most holy œcumenical patriarchs Paisius &c. and Macarius &c., for the reformation of certain ecclesiastical matters needing correction.' This chapter has no date. It has the signatures just like chapter i.]

Summary of contents (with extracts or notices from the original document inserted after certain heads).

i. Bishops are not to ordain in one liturgy three or five, or ten or more deacons and priests, because the canons sentence such as do this to be deposed.

ii. Priests in the liturgy are not to sit in the high place (the episcopal chair behind the altar), nor archimandrites or hegoumens; nor bishops in any other diocese than their own. Nor does even a patriarch, when travelling, sit in the high place in the diocese of a metropolitan or bishop.

iii. When two or three patriarchs are present, how they are to sit in the liturgy (viz. all on chairs in a row, the throne, or high place, being left vacant); also, when a number of metropolitans and bishops are present together, without any patriarch (in like manner, the local bishop not then taking the throne).

iv. A bishop does not give the communion to another bishop (unless the one giving it be a patriarch); nor a priest to another priest (unless the one giving it be an archimandrite); nor does an archimandrite give it to another archimandrite (unless the archimandrite giving it be also a bishop): only a metropolitan communicates the bishops of his own province, and an archimandrite communicates the priests in his own convent. And the clergy communicate thrice, the laity once.

v. At the great introit the priests in taking the gifts are not to change hands.

vi. Deacons not to sprinkle with the holy water.

vii. On Sundays and other festivals of the Lord people are not to labour nor to traffic (except what is necessary for food, &c.); and in the courts and offices trials and other public busi-

ness are not to be carried on (except the tsar's necessary business of state).

viii. Priests in baptising are to read the prayers themselves, and nobody else.

ix. In baptising, candles are not to be plunged in the water, in which there is no meaning: and how many lighted candles (viz. three) there are to be about the font at the time.

x. In the blessing of the water at the Theophany (Jan. 6), and Aug. 1, before plunging the cross they are not to plunge candles.

xi. The custom of archimandrites by command of tsars and grand princes blessing with (the triple and double) lights is not admitted in the Eastern Church. Yet we do not prohibit it, *out of respect to the tsar's majesty*, &c. Wherefore it was admitted: and for the like reasons it was also tolerated that they should wear silver- or gold-covered caps, like mitres. Also, how archimandrites are to celebrate in presence of a bishop; viz. that they are *not then* to bless with the lights, nor indeed to do anything else which is properly peculiar to a bishop in the presence of a bishop. Likewise, with a patriarch standing in the church a bishop cannot celebrate, *and bless*.

xii. On the great Sabbath the procession with the σίνδων [or ἐπιτάφιος, that is, the holy winding-sheet on which is the effigy of Christ dead], and at the consecration of a church the procession with the relics, and in baptisms and marriages, the processions all go to the right, to the east, as in other cases, and not as the custom is now [in Russia] to do in the two last-mentioned cases, making the processions, as it is called, 'with the sun.'

xiii. That ambons are to be made in the churches (yet without insisting on this).

xiv. To all bishops, archimandrites, hegoumens, hieromonachs, and monks, a blessing is given to wear kamilauchia (headdresses) of the Greek fashion, according to the tradition of the Eastern Church. And metropolitans in Russia are allowed to wear a white klobouk, though the reasons alleged for their doing so are not well founded.

xv. Bishops and priests are to teach the people not to eat things strangled, nor to strike any creature on the head or strangle it before killing it with a knife.

xvi. Men and women are not to bathe together naked, as nature itself teaches modesty from the beginning.

xvii. A blessing is given for the sacred order and for monks to use clothes of the Greek fashion, but without compelling any to it; and if any revile such as do this, they, if priests, are to be degraded, if lay people, to be excommunicated.

xviii. To have looking-glasses in the churches and in the sanctuary is not proper; nay, monks and priests ought not to have a looking-glass even in their cells; and we forbid this disorderly practice. But to comb the head and beard in the sanctuary is not [forbidden].

xix. If any ignorant and shameless and lewd people, when a bridegroom and bride come into the holy church to be crowned, insult by foul words the sanctity of the service, such people are to be excommunicated, and are to be punished according to the civil laws.

xx. Before wedding-processions priests are not to ride in their epitrachelia with a cross, but simply.

xxi. The letter of Demetrius Tolmach from [New] Rome to Gennadius archbishop of Novgorod, about the white klobouk and other matters, is not to be credited.

xxii. The writing in the book of the Psalter with the Sequences (the reader's psalter), formerly printed by the prince Valtir, about the manner of putting together the fingers, has been written of ignorance by some secret holder of the Armenian heresy; and it is not to be trusted: and such things are to be erased from the books.

xxiii. The injunction and the anathema put forth through ignorance by the patriarch Nicon about the blessing of the water on the holy Theophany (Jan. 6) is annulled, because it was ill-judged; and now that ceremony is to be performed [not only on the eve, but also on the day itself of the festival].

xxiv. The Slujebnik (service-book or missal) printed in A.M. 7176 [7173, A.D. 1655] is approved; and so in future it is to be used without any evasion.

xxv. The book entitled the Skrijal (the πίναξ) is to be held in great honour: yet it is not every man who is capable of reading it to good purpose; not, for instance, such as the popes Nicetas, Lazarus, Abbakoum, and their fellows.

xxvi. The *epistle* of the most holy œcumenical patriarch

Paisius and his synod, concerning ecclesiastical matters [especially concerning the correction of the books, written in A.D. 1664, from C.P. to the patriarch Nicon], is confirmed.

xxvii. Of the book entitled the *Staff of Rule* (composed against the popes Nicetas and Lazarus), on what account it was composed, and against whom is its anathema. Nicetas, however, has acknowledged his error, and repented of it *before us*. So now this Staff is only against Lazarus, Abbakoum, Nicephorus, and Epiphanius of the Solovetsky, and Theodore the deacon.

xxviii. Of the Creed, the Alleluia, the collocation of the fingers in making the sign of the cross, the patriarchs refer to another separate manifesto,[39] and to ch. xxvi. xxviii. xxix. and xxx. of the *Staff of Rule*.

xxix. Every priest is to teach his children letters, and all good discipline: and of the cause whence schisms arise in the Church.

xxx. It is not right for the priests of the holy Church to keep taverns. To sell the churches of Christ and church-places as hereditary property is very wrong.

xxxi. An injunction, under pain of excommunication, how every order [of clergy and lay people] is to stand in the church during the singing of the divine service.

xxxii. That the genuflections or prostrations are to be made in the church of God by all in due order, and without diversity, on each day, according to the tradition and rule.

xxxiii. In the funeral of a dead man who is carried to the church or grave, the clergy are to go first, and not to follow the bier, as is customary.

xxxiv. How the pannychid is to be sung for the dead; and of the rest of the office for the dead.

xxxv. In the sacred liturgy, when the lights are to be put out (viz. *not* at the cherubic hymn, nor at the *Dostoino yest*, *i.e.* the Ἄξιον ἐστὶν κ.τ.λ.).

xxxvi. It is not proper to bring one's own icons into the church and set them up apart (hence ignorant people call their icons their *gods*), and set lights before them apart. Nor is it

[39] viz. that contained in chapter iii. below, which so seems to be of earlier date than this chapter ii. Also the dates attached to several of these xl. chapters show that they are not put together here in chronological order.

proper on the Lord's festivals to take the icons from the church into private houses, so stripping the church of them.

Subtitle: 'Of the spiritual jurisdiction.'

xxxvii. In the house of the patriarch and in the houses of all the bishops for the judgment of persons of the spiritual order there must be spiritual judges.

[From the original document: 'We have consulted with our brother the most holy Joasaph &c., and with all the sacred synod [and we have agreed] that there shall be a *spiritual* person, that is, an archimandrite, with other well-skilled men in the patriarchal house to judge in spiritual matters, and to judge *spiritual persons*, that is, *priests and monks; that henceforth they may not bring priests and monks before secular tribunals, nor secular persons judge those of the sacred and monastic order, or any of all the clergy of the Church;* since the holy canons of the holy apostles and the holy fathers forbid this. See canon ix. of Chalcedon and xv. of Carthage; and the laws of the religious emperors. Likewise in the book of the laws of the emperor Justinian, ch. lxviii. lxxiv. lxxxvii. and [in the laws of] the emperor Manuel Comnenus, ch. lxii. &c.[40]

xxxviii. Also in matrimonial causes and in causes of affinity, they, the same spiritual judges, are to examine the people according to the canons; and the same are to attest wills at the deaths of people of all orders.

[From the original document: 'In like manner we order that in all the bishops' houses there be a well-skilled spiritual person to judge spiritual persons and spiritual causes, in like manner as in the house of the patriarch. And the spiritual judge, that is, the archimandrite, with his assessors, shall judge archimandrites, hegoumens, monks, protopopes, deacons, and all ecclesiastical clerks and nuns, in all manner of causes. And of the laity, if any fall into incestuous or unlawful marriage, or the like, the same judges shall examine all such cases, according to the sacred canons. And wills they shall attest.']

xxxix. All other spiritual matters between lay people, men or women, shall be judged by the patriarch's boyar, with the secretaries or clerks his colleagues. And *they who reject this our canonical enactment shall be judged of God* in this world and

[40] See too the *Replies of Nicon*, p. 668.

in the world to come, together with Dathan and Abiram and Koreh.[41]

xl. How deacons, protodiacons, archidiacons, and popes are to sit; and when they may preside.

[From the original document: 'The synod reënacts can. vii. of the council in Trullo: deacons are not to take precedence of priests, except when a deacon, for instance, is representing his patriarch or metropolitan. Therefore the protodiacon of the cathedral is not to sit before the dignified priests of the same church, nor, by right, before *any* priest. However, of condescension, we say that though he may be tolerated in sitting before other undignified village priests, still this must not be carried farther. And in like manner of an archidiacon, who must not sit above dignified hieromonachs, unless he be sent anywhere by the most holy patriarch, in which case he may have all honour.']

xli. All the bishops of the Russian empire ought frequently to assemble in synod in the capital city of Moscow.

[From the original document: 'It is proper that, according to the canons of the holy apostles and of all the œcumenical and local synods, the bishops in every country and province should hold synods twice in the year, or (if that is inconvenient) at least once. However, in these regions of the empire of Great Russia the bishops have not been used to assemble often to hold synods and to revise ecclesiastical causes &c.; and hence it is that there have arisen so many schismatics and agitators, who have disturbed all the empire and destroyed many souls, and have been within a little of deceiving all the people, and perverting them from the orthodox faith to absurd practices and heretical imaginations. And for this cause it is now very needful that the bishops of all the Russian empire should meet together more frequently in the capital for all manner of good consultations, and to correct such things as need correction in the Church.']

xlii. The bishops in their several eparchies are to eradicate all heretical tares.

[From the original document: 'Every bishop must watch in his own eparchy with great vigilance and all precaution, that in future such diabolical tares grow not up; but let him pluck them up at once, that he may hear those words of God: "Well done, good and faithful servant;" and that they may receive unfading

[41] See the *Replies of Nicon*, p. 345 and 668.

crowns of everlasting life: which may we all receive by the grace and mercy of our Lord Jesus Christ!']

Of icon-painters, and of the Lord of Sabaoth.

xliii. Over icon-painters there should be inspectors (the inspector should be himself a skilful painter, a good man, and an ecclesiastic). Representations of the Lord of Sabaoth are not to be painted. Also saints on the icons are not to be painted with the fingers *put together*[42] for prayer, but with extended hands.

xliv. The Lord of Sabaoth [that is, the Eternal Father], with the Saviour on his breast, and the dove between them representing the Holy Ghost, are not to be painted on icons. Only in icons of the Theophany the form of a dove is to be painted.

xlv. The breath of the Lord of Sabaoth descending upon the blessed Virgin the Mother of God is not to be painted in icons of the Annunciation. Only in the Apocalypse of St. John, if there be need, the Father is painted with grey hair.

xlvi. In the holy churches on the *deisises* [that is, the triptych icons called in Greek δέησις] instead of the Lord of Sabaoth there is to be put the Crucifixion of Jesus Christ.

xlvii. The metropolitans of all Russia, Peter, Alexis, and Jonah, are painted by the icon-painters with white klobouks improperly. [On this head xlvii. observe that Peter, the first metropolitan of Moscow, was earlier than Gennadius archbishop of Novgorod, to whom was addressed the letter mentioned above of Demetrius Tolmach; Gennadius being, according to that letter, contemporary with Philotheus patriarch of Constantinople, whereas Peter was the contemporary of the patriarch Athanasius. And in fact none of the Russian metropolitans who were consecrated at Constantinople down to Photius ever wore a white klobouk. The letter of Demetrius Tolmach professes to have been sent by the patriarch Philotheus to *Basil* archbishop of Novgorod. Peter was consecrated by the patriarch Athanasius in A.M. 6816 (A.D. 1308). The metropolitan Alexis of Moscow (A.D. 1353-1380) was contemporary with the patriarch of C.P. Philotheus, above fifty years after the death of Peter. Till the time of Gennadius[43] the white klobouk was peculiar to

[42] See the *Travels of Macarius*, p. 150, 151.

[43] Archbishop of Novgorod towards the end of the 15th century. See Mouravieff's *History*, &c. p. 90 and 58.

Novgorod; but from his time the metropolitans of Moscow began to wear it also, and the rest.]

Of the monastic order.

i. Monks and nuns are not to go about from the monastery in which they have been professed to another.

ii. Without a probation no person of either sex is to be tonsured to the monastic habit (*σχῆμα*); nor may minors be tonsured.

iii. Young married men, no matter whether in health or sick, are not to be tonsured without the consent of their wives and parents: and in like manner of young women.

iv. No monastery is to receive a monk or nun who has been tonsured in another monastery.

v. If a monk or a nun when summoned to return to his monastery does not obey, the superiors of the monasteries are to report this to the bishop.

vi. Whatever monastery has monks or nuns who wander about out of the monastery, they are to be punished not only by the ecclesiastical laws, but also by the civil.

vii. Gifts to a monastery from monks and nuns are not to be received (see canon xix. of the Seventh œcum. council).

viii. If a monk or a nun without the blessing of their superior goes out of their convent, and drinks and passes the night out, how they are to be punished.

ix. Neither may a monk sleep in a monastery of nuns, nor a nun in a monastery of men, nor pass the night there, under any pretence whatever.

x. To all persons of the sacred and monastic order, without exception, all commerce and trade is forbidden. Nor may they sit in shops. But monks and nuns may sell the work of their own hands.

xi. Every clerk and monk and nun is bound not to give themselves to secular cares, nor may they stand surety for any man, nor implicate themselves with such as do.

xii. Of holy idiots, such as Andrew and Simeon; how they are distinguishable from certain impostors. . . . [Hypocritical impostors, who are to be found sometimes between towns and villages on the way, overgrown with long hair, and having wrapped about them a monastic svitka, are not to be respected. But as

for him who is an idiot from his birth, he is neither to be praised nor blamed for what he may do.]

CHAPTER III.

[In the original document there is first a heading thus: 'An explanation by the patriarchs Paisius &c. and Macarius &c. of the *Alleluia;* and of the manner of putting the fingers together in making the sign of the cross; and an injunction concerning the Creed; and concerning the Lord's prayer,' &c.

This document too has the signatures just like chapters i. and ii.; that is, all the earlier names are subscribed or written on the tops and bottoms of each leaf, and those of the remaining archimandrites and hegoumens only at the end. But there is no date either to this or to chapter ii. However, chapter ii. seems to be later than this, since in its § xxviii. it refers to it.]

Separate summary of contents.

i. A full explanation about the Alleluia.

ii. Of the manner of putting together the fingers in making the sign of the cross.

iii. Of the Prayer to Jesus.

iv. A synodal decree respecting the [addition of the adjective '*true*' in the] Creed, and of certain other matters.

v. Of the Alleluia; what is the order to be followed in the church.

CHAPTER IV.

Separate summary of contents.

i. Are robbers and thieves not to be admitted to the communion in the holy mysteries at their last hour, when they are to die? How to confess them.

ii. How those who have been condemned are to be confessed and communicated; viz. that they should be communicated two days before their execution: and how confessors are to judge and instruct such criminals.

iii. How persons of the sacred and monastic order, who are found committing such crimes, are to be punished as lay people.

iv. Sons of priests, if unordained, when found committing robbery or theft, are to be punished as lay people.

v. That a thief, if he steal in a church, though it be nothing belonging to the church, is guilty also of sacrilege; and how such are to be punished.

vi. If any one of the sacred order, or any monk or nun, keep shops or houses, and let into those houses people of all sorts for hire, how they are to be dealt with for this.

From the original document.

This chapter iv., after a title 'Questions answered by the *two* most holy patriarchs' &c., begins thus:

'The monk Nicon &c. spake before the tsar &c. and all the synclete, enjoining in the ears of all and teaching thus:[44] That he certainly would forbid priests in future not only to give the communion to robbers and thieves, but even to confess them before their execution; adding, that if any one acted against this order he should give account for it to God in the day of judgment. Thus Nicon, and they that followed him, enjoined publicly both by writing and by word of mouth. And *hence* robbers and thieves have *multiplied;* and they lie now in the prisons a long time. What of this?'

Answer. To this we say that that is all *heretical,* and utterly contrary to law, and strange to the Church of Christ. For in holding and teaching thus Nicon and his followers appear to be Novatians and Eustathians, who would not receive penitents at all, thinking and speaking against the apostles and the divine fathers. For canon lii. of the Apostles says: 'If any bishop or presbyter receives not a man *who returns from his sins* &c.: and canon ii. of Laodicea &c.: and xlvi. of Carthage; and lv. of St. Basil; and can. xiii. of the First council of Nice. And we [the patriarchs Paisius and Macarius &c.] interpret this canon of the CCCXVIII. fathers thus (as in can. vii. of Carthage): and we agree with the deacon Alexius Aristin in his gloss on the same in the Πηδάλιον, &c. And see canon lxxvi. of Ancyra, and can. v. of Gregory of Nyssa; and Matthew Blastar in his Syntagma Alphabeticum M. ch. xi.'

(On ii.) The answer to the second question, About the time before the execution of criminals, ends with these words: 'On this point, in replying to the above-written question, we find Nicon very culpable, and them that follow him, viz. in the matter of penitence and communion in the holy mysteries.'

(From iii.) The Question. Many of the priestly order are

[44] See the *Replies of Nicon*, p. 16-19; *Travels of Macarius*, p. 27; and Paisius' *History*, &c. p. 94-98.

found implicated in robberies and thefts, and in coining base money, &c.: how are these to be punished according to the laws? Answer. There are two tribunals found in the universe, one ecclesiastical (which is called the *inner*), which judges of souls, the other secular (which is also called the *outer*), and this takes cognisance only of what is bodily. And there are two deaths, temporal and eternal. And on this account the same judges are not to judge and punish at once both spiritually and bodily. For it is not given that one and the same person should have the two powers together, the secular, that is, and the ecclesiastical: but it is needful that each keep his own order and the judgment of his own tribunal. However, the priest or deacon or monk, or other person of the sacred order, who plunges into unseemly deeds, and takes part [with felons] against the empire [*i.e.* offends against the criminal laws of the civil power], is first to be punished ecclesiastically, according to the sacred canons, by the local bishop: and then, if the same person offends a second time, let him be punished also by the civil tribunals. And if he who, being of the sacred order, implicates himself in secular cares, is by canon vi. of the holy Apostles to be degraded unless he desist, how much more are they to be degraded who give themselves to robbery and theft, and to pecuniary frauds? It is proper, then, that such be punished also by the civil tribunal, if they fall *a second time* into such sins, or into any other of those written above. For Matthew Blastar writes (ch. xv.): 'If any one without the emperor's order coins money, whether gold pieces or silver currency, whether of gold or silver, pure or debased, both his hands are to be cut off. And if any man knows of another that he forges such money, and does not inform, one of his hands is to be cut off, &c. [quoting at length]. And the *first time* ecclesiastics coining money are to be judged ecclesiastically, according to the sacred canons, as thieves. And if they repent and amend, well: but if they offend *again* and are taken a second time, they are then to be punished according to the civil laws.' But of the sons of priests &c. we say: If they have not received the imposition of the bishop's hands with prayer, they are to be punished as laymen in the secular courts for their crimes: but if they are ordained [*i.e.* if they are clerics or monks], they are to be punished first ecclesiastically, as clerks, by excommunication or deposition, according to their crimes.

(From iv.) Priests &c. are to be deposed according to the canons. As for *monks acquiring property* contrary to their vows &c., the power of the patriarch *and that of the tsar* [note that the power of the patriarch is here named first] ought to *take away* such monastic possessions, *and distribute them to the poor*, according to the sense of canon v. of the First and Second council.

CHAPTER V.

[The original has a title thus: 'Order of the divine liturgy &c. from the all-holiest Kyr Athanasius Patellarius, some time œcumenical patriarch of C.P., which he spake and delivered when he was at Moscow in A.M. 7161, A.D. 1653; attested in the same city of Moscow by the most holy patriarchs Paisius &c. and Macarius &c. in A.M. 7175, A.D. 1667. *Eyda'* &c.]

Separate summary of contents.

i. The *Order of the Divine Liturgy entire, for the celebration of a bishop*, laid down and authenticated &c. (22 leaves, including three notes or appendices, as follows):

ii. When a patriarch puts off his omophorion, and when he puts it on: and when he puts off and puts on his mitre.

iii. Question. Whether it is right in the absence of a bishop for any one else of the sacred order to consecrate new churches? and how is this to be done? Answer. A priest does not properly do this; nevertheless in case of need he may.

iv. Question. Are priests and deacons to wear skouphias (caps), according to our old custom? Answer. Yes; they should have their heads always covered, even though the Russian skouphia is not like ours.

[This chapter has the signatures all on the leaves, and none of them at the end, as in fact there are only those of the great hierarchs repeated over and over again, and at the end that of the patriarch Paisius in cipher.]

CHAPTER VI.

The original document begins thus: 'In the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, Amen. In this present year 7175, *March*[45] 15, A.D. 1667, by care of the great hossoudar

[45] Paisius Ligarides in his *History &c.* has 'March 10:' but the discussion of the questions proposed by the tsar, if begun then, may have lasted till the 15th, and the decision may have been re-confirmed in June following.

the tsar &c., the most holy patriarchs Paisius &c., Macarius &c., and Joasaph &c., assembled together with the most reverend the metropolitans &c.: To whom the great hossoudar &c. made an address respecting the synod held in time past in A.M. 7129, A.D. 1621, under the great hossoudar Philaret Niketich, patriarch of Moscow and all Russia, about the baptism of those who come from the Roman faith to the orthodox faith of the holy Eastern Church, asking whether it was rightly ordered by that synod to *baptise* them?

Separate summary of contents.

i. How to receive such people as come over from the Roman faith to the orthodox faith of the holy Eastern Church. [Canons; and previously published Judgment.]

ii. What heresy of the Latins is weightiest: and that it is not right to baptise them.

iii. That in old times also one synod was often corrected by another.

iv. The decree of the synod held at Moscow in the time of the most holy patriarch Philaret for [re]baptising the Latins who come to the Eastern Church is annulled.

v. Testimony of an old book and of the synod held in Constantinople (A.D. 1484) concerning Latin baptism.

[This chapter is written on nine leaves, and has the signatures, with the date '*June* 1667,' in the same manner with chapters i. ii. and iii., the greater part at the tops and bottoms of the pages, and only those which remained over at the end. It has been printed at full in the volume entitled *Dissertations on the Orthodox Communion*, London, Masters, 1853, p. 188-197. And see above, p. 288-295.]

CHAPTER VII.

Questions addressed by the most holy Joasaph and the most reverend the metropolitans and archbishops and bishops of Russia to the most holy œcumenical patriarchs Paisius &c. and Macarius &c.; and their answers.

Separate summary of contents.

i. On the day of Pentecost, how to read the prayers which are said kneeling (that is, turning to the west, or to the east)? These prayers are to be read towards the people, to the west; but other prayers to the east.

ii. Of the blessing of the water at the festival of the Theophany? It is to be performed as it was performed in this present year 1667 by the œcumenical patriarchs. [See above, p. 207; and *Travels of Macarius*, p. 279, 315.]

iii. In the parish churches at what times are the bells to be sounded? For the liturgy at the second hour of the day: but in Lent and at other fasts after the bell of the cathedral has sounded.

iv. When a bishop celebrates the liturgy, who is to make the offertory (the προσκομιδή)? Answer. One priest [of those concelebrating with the bishop].

v. The [double] ἐκτενὴς, and the prayers which are read on the Wednesday in the fourth week of Lent in the liturgy of the Presanctified, are not to be said in the liturgy of St. Basil and in that of St. John Chrysostom on the Sabbath and the Sunday.

vi. How each order is to be communicated in the most holy Body and Blood of Christ.

vii. Priests and deacons are not to go from church to church without the blessing of the bishop.

viii. Of those whom the patriarch Nicon ordained in the monastery of Voskresensk *before his deposition*, how they are to be dealt with, or ranked?

[From the original document: 'Answer. These ordinations are to be held *valid* for the reason that they were performed *before* his *deposition* from the patriarchate. But for the future after his deposition' (*now* validly made by *us*) 'no one can be ordained by him to any order whatever.']

ix. Hieromonachs and monks are not without the blessing of the bishop to go from monastery to monastery: and archimandrites and hegoumens are not to receive them without letters dimissory.

x. In the houses of lay people no one, though sick, is to be tonsured, but only in the monastery of his choice.

xi. In houses of lay people persons of the monastic order are not to live.

xii. How to tonsure a person to the monastic order.

xiii. If they who live in a monastery do not submit themselves to any superior [how are they to be dealt with?].

xiv. Of priests who run from one diocese to another, and celebrate marriages unlawfully.

xv. Hieromonachs and monks are to have their confessors only in their own monastery, and not in any other.

xvi. How superiors in monasteries are to deal with drunkenness: and that Russian wine is not at all to be admitted into monasteries.

xvii. Penitents without letters dimissory from their confessor are not to go needlessly to confession to another: and in cases of necessity how to act.

xviii. How to deal with such as run away from their lords, and are ordained priests and deacons, or tonsured to be monks in monasteries?

['Answer. Runaways ordained priests or monks, and reclaimed, are to be dealt with according to the canons: that is, they are to be degraded, and then given up.']

xix. And to what penalties does he subject himself who ordains or tonsures any such?

xx. They that are of the sacred and spiritual order and their people are not to be judged any of them by any secular people whatever.

[From the original document: 'Respecting bishops, archimandrites and hegoumens, priests and deacons, monks and nuns, and all the ecclesiastical and spiritual order, *and their people:* Is it competent for lay persons to judge them? Answer. Bishops &c. *and their people* may *not in any case* be judged by lay persons. They are to be judged in all matters by the bishops, by each bishop in his own diocese, or by such spiritual person as he shall appoint to judge, but *not by lay people.*'

Then follow the signatures (still remaining to sign after those occupying the tops and bottoms of the pages), the first of these being the humble Misael bishop of Kolomna, followed by the humble Lazarus bishop of Chernigoff and Novgorod-Sieversk, the humble Alexander bishop of Viatka, the humble Methodius bishop of Mstislaff and Pinsk; and then by archimandrites, Philaret of the Rojdestvennoy at Vladimir, Joachim of the Choudoff, Joseph of the Novospass, and twelve others.

Then there is an appendix, as follows:]

i. As regards them that upon the petition of the landowners have been ordained popes [having been before serfs], what is to be done with their children born before their ordination, and with them that may be born after it? that is, Are children

born before the ordination of their father, if their father is afterwards moved to another place, liable to be claimed as serfs by the landlord? or may the father take them away with him? Answer. Those born before the ordination are serfs; those born after it, or only a little before it, are free.

ii. If in a village the hereditary proprietor or the holder of a government grant of land lets go his peasant to become a priest or deacon, and he, when ordained, breaking his promise, goes off to another church, what is to be the consequence, or the punishment? and what is to be the condition of the children? Answer. The man must return; but his children born after his ordination, being free, may go where they please.

iii. What is to be the state of priests and deacons who marry a second time, and to what order do they belong? Ans. There is some difference in the enactments on this subject. It is *more honourable* to abide unmarried, and to serve. By a constitution of Leo Sapiens, ch. xix. of the Novells, in the book of Blastar, letter H, it is not forbidden to such as remarry to wear the clerical dress; they are even allowed to do some clerical acts, like inferior clerks, *outside* the altar, *i.e.* such as subdeacons and readers do.

[From the original document: 'The constitution of Leo Sapiens says: "We do not receive the too severe rule of the ancient legislation which utterly excludes from the clerical character such digamists, and reduces them in all respects to the state of laymen. It is punishment enough that they lose their orders of priest and deacon, and are as clerks without the altar." According to this we also give our judgment, but without making it imperative, that if any priests, deacons, or subdeacons have remarried, such may be recognised *as clerks outside the altar*, and may be fed by the Church, and are not to be utterly abhorred; and they may engage in any secular work of which they are capable, except war.']

iv. Whether heretics and schismatics ought to be punished also by the civil laws, or only by ecclesiastical penalties? Answer. Yes; by all means, they ought to be punished also by the civil laws.

[And the text of the original document continues thus: 'For in the Second holy œcumenical council, held at C.P. under Theodosius the Great against the blasphemer against the Holy Ghost Macedonius, where there were present thirty-six irreligious

bishops followers of the heresy of Macedonius, the divinely-inspired fathers, after the deposition and anathematisation of those irreligious bishops, ordered that they should be punished also by the civil laws. And so by command of the religious emperor Theodosius they were beaten severely with thongs of bull's hide, and set derisively on the backs of camels and led about the market-place. And afterwards they sent them to Emessa, a city of Syria; and there they died miserably. And in the Fourth œcumenical council, held at Chalcedon by the DCXXX. holy fathers under the religious emperor Marcian and the empress Pulcheria, against the Monothelites Dioscorus and Eutyches, these divinely-inspired fathers with the religious emperor ordered that their impious works should be burned, and they themselves punished by being severely whipped with thongs of bull's hide, and with knotted sticks, and by imprisonment. Farther, they ordered that there should be taken for the emperor from them and from their partisans a fine of ten gold grivnas each. The holy œcumenical council held under Justinian at C.P. against Origen and his partisans, after deposing and anathematising them, gives a command in concert with the religious emperor to imprison them also by virtue of the civil laws, and to punish them with divers pains and penalties. And so of some they cut out the tongues, of others they cut off the heads, of others they cut off the ears and noses, and pilloried them in the market-place; and after that they were sent into exile for the rest of their lives. And in the Seventh council, under the emperor Michael and his mother Theodora, we read that her husband the emperor Theophilus had driven out Methodius; but after his death Methodius was restored; and Theodora caused the intrusive patriarch John to be whipped with thongs of bull's hide with 200 lashes, and all his followers likewise: and she caused him to be blinded, and to be sent with his followers to the most rude places of exile.'

This appendix (of four articles) has the signatures only of the *two* patriarchs Paisius and Macarius, repeated over and over again.]

CHAPTER VIII.

Separate summary of contents.

i. Synodal constitution specifying in what cities new episcopal titles are to be created, and what sees are to be raised in

rank; and directing that in time to come, whenever there may be need, new sees shall be erected in Russia.

ii. The city of Kalouga with Torouss is to be erected into a new see, to be taken out of the patriarchal diocese.

iii. If anywhere in a diocese there be found churches near to other dioceses, the neighbouring bishop may at the request of the diocesan administer them, according as may be convenient.

From the original document.

'We, Paisius &c. and Macarius &c., by the wish of the tsar have held meetings with the Russian bishops and with the Greek bishops &c. present in Moscow: and we have heard words from the tsar concerning his earnest wish for the setting right of certain most urgent ecclesiastical needs, and concerning those who are disobedient to the holy *Eastern* Church: and these same things by God's help we have settled, and have composed a synodical act, and have subscribed it with our hands.

'Likewise in this same year 7175, A.D. 1667, June [25 ?], we have met again: and the tsar has addressed us, expressing his desire that for the perfecting of the Church there should be instituted in certain cities which have them not at present, metropolitans, archbishops, and bishops. And he caused to be laid before us a letter of his ancestor the tsar Theodore Ivanovich &c. for the establishment of episcopal chairs, with the coöperation and blessing of the most holy Jeremiah patriarch of C.P. and of the most holy Job patriarch of Moscow &c. and of other Russian and Greek bishops. This letter we, the patriarchs &c. with the metropolitans, archbishops, and bishops, have caused to be read in the synod; and we have found in it the decree of the tsar Theodore, and the blessing of the most holy patriarchs, and the consent of the other bishops, for there being in the great sovereignty of Novgorod a metropolitan, and in the capital cities of Kazan and Astrachan metropolitans, and in the grand principality of the city of Rostoff a metropolitan, also near the capital city of Moscow at Kroutitz a metropolitan; and six archbishops, viz. one in the grand principality of Vologda, one in the grand principality of Souzdal, one in the grand principality of Nijny Novgorod, one in the grand principality of Smolensk, one in the grand principality of Riazan, and one in the grand principality of Tver; also eight bishops, viz. in the city of the grand principality of Pskoff, in the grand principality of Rjeff, in the grand

principality of Oustiog, in the grand principality of Bielozersk, in the appanage principality of Kolomna, and in Briansk (these two bishopries being restored), and in Chernigoff, and in the appanage principality of Dmitroff.

'Having heard this, and seeing [that document &c.], we rejoiced; and we have judged and confirmed [the wish of the tsar] that this be so: and that in places not now having them there be appointed bishops; viz. in the grand principality of Nijny Novgorod an archbishop, in the grand principality of Rjeff of Vladimir a bishop, in the grand principality of Great Oustiog in lieu of a bishop an archbishop, in the grand principality of Bielozersk a bishop, in the appanage principality of Dmitroff a bishop, in Chernigoff in lieu of a bishop an archbishop, likewise in Kolomna in lieu of a bishop an archbishop. Let these cities each of them have bishops; that the decree of the tsar Theodore Ivanovich may be carried into effect, together with the zealous wish of our tsar Alexis Michaelovich, and that of the most holy patriarchs Jeremiah and Job &c. Farther, we have requested the tsar that the capital city of Astrachan be honoured with a metropolitan chair, since we, *though against our will*, passed by it: and the tsar having consented, we have asked the most holy patriarch Joasaph &c. to raise the archbishop Joseph to be its metropolitan. Also we have confirmed the conversion of the bishopric of the great city of Pskoff into an archbishopric. The bishop of Viatka is to be still bishop. In Great Perm too the existing bishop is to be still bishop. In the city of Archangel and Kholmogori there is to be an archbishop. In the kingdom of Siberia, in Tobolsk, in lieu of an archbishop a metropolitan, in Tomsk a bishop, and at Lena also a bishop. After this we heard of cities having been newly founded in the Ukraine, viz. Bielgorod, with many other towns near it, and that voivodes are sent thither. There also there is to be a bishop, and in those towns a metropolitan see.

'And we give our blessing to the tsar *with the consent* of the most holy patriarch of Moscow &c. and with that of the bishops of the Russian empire, according to his discretion to appoint metropolitans, archbishops, and bishops. And we ordain *that each metropolitan have under him bishops*, according to the canons, for the complete organisation of the Church. In the province of the metropolitan of Novgorod there is to be a bishop of Kargopol,

and a bishop in Gorodetz or Oustiog; under the metropolitan of Kazan, in his province, there is to be a bishop at Oufa; in the province of the metropolitan of Rostoff a bishop at Ouglich; in the province of the metropolitan of Kroutitz there is to be a bishop at Livni. The archbishopric of Riazan we have changed into a metropolitan see, and under it we have ordained that there be a bishop at Voronege, and another at Tamboff. And those bishops are to live each of them *subject to his metropolitan*, in *their* eparchies, with the towns and the monastery allotted them, and the lands of the estates of that monastery; and they are to do all by the blessing and according to the order of their metropolitans, except celebrating and ordaining, and the rest of those things which the sacred canons require them to do.

'Also we bless and confirm to the archbishop of Souzdal all the riding of Souzdal, and besides that of Yourieff (or Dorpat) of the Poles, to be in his diocese. But Torouss and Kalouga [are to be] in the patriarchal [province or] diocese. And in like manner in the other dioceses the churches existing in them are to be governed by that prelate to whose diocese they most naturally and conveniently belong [that is, to whom the tsar for such reasons may assign them].

'And now, that all these dispositions may be confirmed and may have force for the future, we have authenticated this synodal act by the subscription of our patriarchal hands &c. and by the signatures of the rest of the bishops. Written at Moscow in the year of the world 7175 (A.D. 1667), —th June.'

At the end (besides the signatures on the tops and bottoms of the pages) there is the signature of Philaret archimandrite of the Rojdestvennoy monastery at Vladimir, and those of thirteen others.

CHAPTER IX.

Separate summary of its heads.

i. The prohibition made at different times about widower priests not celebrating was well made. Those, however, who are open to no suspicion, though they be widowers, are henceforth not forbidden to celebrate.

ii. If a widower priest is detected in any crime, let him be suspended from ministering in sacred things, or let him be deposed.

iii. A layman whose wife has committed adultery is not to be ordained.

iv. A clerk who knows his wife to be committing adultery, if he does not put her away, is to be degraded.

v. In old time priests who had no wives used to celebrate.

From the full text of the original.

Among the most necessary matters needing reconsideration this also has not remained unnoticed by the synod, that widower priests and deacons have been forbidden to minister by Russian synods held at different times.

This has now been examined into by [the three patriarchs and by all the bishops and the synod], and it has been judged that, though it is without any countenance from the canons that the rule has been laid down that widower priests and deacons are not to minister in the divine liturgy, still on account of the danger of disorders being multiplied through inexperienced (*i.e.* young) ecclesiastics, and in order to guard against such danger, this rule was well made. For some men at that time from ignorance, contemning the sacred canons, and trampling under foot their own consciences, dared to minister when they were unworthy. But they who made the rule neglected to distinguish between the pure and the incontinent, who are always to be separated (*i.e.* forbidden to celebrate). But now, since by the grace of God there are now in Russia people to be found, priests and deacons, who have knowledge of the divine scriptures &c., and both know what are canonical offences, and lead pure lives [though they may be widowers], the patriarchs and the synod decree that henceforth a widower priest or deacon, if he has nothing on his conscience to forbid him to minister, may minister unforbidden.[46] But if any widower be convicted before the bishop of any crime constituting an impediment, let him be suspended or degraded, according to the nature of his offence. For since a man is not qualified by having a wife to be a priest or a deacon, neither is he by losing a wife through death disqualified or inhibited from celebration. But it is for the vice of incontinence that they are inhibited. . . . For by the old canons they that had not wives were not inhibited, as the canons of the holy fathers show; for example, can. iv. of St. Cyril of Alexandria; and the Novells of Justinian, ch. xlii. constit. xlvi.; and St. Basil writing to the priest Gregory, can. lxxxvii. Going upon these canons,

[46] See *Travels of Macarius*, p. 81.

we &c. [as above] decree &c. [as aforesaid]. Written at Moscow A.M. 7175 (A.D. 1667), June —.

[And then, at the end (the earlier signatures being on the tops and bottoms of the pages): 'The humble Paul metropolitan of Sarai and Podonsk, Ὁ ταπεινὸς μητροπολίτης Γάζεων Παίσιος' the humble Theodosius metropolitan of Bielgorod (Archangel), the humble Philaret archbishop of Smolensk, the humble Stephen archbishop of Souzdal, the humble Hilarion archbishop of Riazan, the humble Misael bishop of Kolomna, the humble Lazarus Baranovich bishop of Chernigoff and of Novgorod-Sieversk, the humble Alexander bishop of Viatka, the humble Methodius bishop of Mstislaf and Pinsk;' and fifteen archimandrites and hegoumens, beginning with Philaret the archimandrite of the Rojdestvennoy at Vladimir. At the tops of the leaves there had preceded the ciphers of the two Greek patriarchs, and the signatures of the patriarch Joasaph of Moscow, and of the four metropolitans, Pitirim of Novgorod, Laurentius of Kazan, Joseph of Astrachan, and Jonah of Rostoff.

CHAPTER X.

Separate summary of its heads.

i. Of the synod (the *Stoglav*) held at Moscow in A.M. 7059 (A.D. 1551) in the reign of John IV. Basilievich.

ii. Of the canon for having seven deacons; that they did not rightly understand them, but afterwards corrected the error.

iii. Errors which may have been fallen into even by synods are without blame or scruple, and of right, to be corrected.

iv. Of the correction of ecclesiastical matters: of the printed and MS. books, how they are to be esteemed; and what diligent care should be taken about this.

v. What synod is to be received.

vi. What punishment is to be inflicted on such as are disobedient in respect of the corrections made by this present synod.

From the original document.

An Instruction concerning the synod held in A.M. 7059 (A.D. 1551) under the tsar &c. John IV. Basilievich, and concerning certain errors: About the Alleluia; and with what fingers to make the sign of the cross: About the four-ended cross, and the catholic (*i.e.* common) prayer which is Κύριε Ἰησοῦ Χριστὲ,

ἐλέησον ἡμᾶς' and of the other discrepancies [discrepancies, that is, from the Greek use] found in the former printed books in expressions, and in ritual directions, which have now all in this present synod, by the grace of the Holy Ghost, been corrected: With an Exposition by the most holy patriarchs of the holy Eastern Church, with all the sacred synod of the Church of all Russia.

'But for those who praise God, as in the Creed &c., inconsistently with the old Slavonic MSS. and the Greek books, and adduce for the double Alleluia and their way of putting together the fingers that synod which was held in the time of John IV. Basilievich and the metropolitan Macarius, the answer of this synod is as follows:'

[Then follow examples of councils abrogating or changing earlier enactments of the Old and of the New Testaments: Paul yielding to Peter and James at Jerusalem, &c. Canon xv. of Neocæsarea, of having seven deacons, is repealed by the Sixth œcumenical council. The same Sixth council sets aside the canon of the council of Carthage for communicating after supper; and can. viii. of the same Sixth council repeals that canon of the Apostles which forbids a bishop to leave his wife.]

'But if any oppose what is now reformed and decreed in the synodal exposition respecting the Alleluia and the cross &c. &c., made in this year 1667, and contained in the book entitled the *Staff of Rule*, he will be, as St. Paul says, "of himself condemned," and he will be an inheritor of the curse of this council, written in its synodal act, as being disobedient to God and to the canons of the holy fathers.'

At the end there follow the subscriptions of Hilarion archbishop of Riazan, and fifteen archimandrites and hegoumens, besides all the other names which had been subscribed before on the tops of the pages.

CHAPTER XI.

Separate summary of its heads.

i. A synodal manifesto respecting those estates of different churches and monasteries which the patriarch Nicon took from them, giving others in exchange, or which he bought, and attached to his newly-founded monasteries.

ii. Bishops are not to sell ecclesiastical things or properties.

iii. If any one *of his own will* sells ecclesiastical property, how he is to be punished.

iv. If any one, even the bishop, sells the land of his own church or anything else, for any need whatever, without the cognisance of *the highest superior* [the patriarch? or the tsar?], he is to lose his honour.

v. A bishop or an hegoumen who sells anything whatever belonging to the church or the monastery is to be deposed.

vi. A bishop is not to found monasteries of his own *to the impoverishment of his see.*

vii. *Wherefore* in such matters the patriarch Nicon was condemned.

viii. Letters [*i.e.* grants and title-deeds given *by the tsar*] to estates *with imprecations* [on such as shall alienate the estates, or infringe the dispositions contained in the letters] *are set aside* [by *us*, for *the boyars*], as of no weight.

ix. What monasteries of his foundation, and for what reasons, are still to remain.

x. The estates of the house of the patriarch, however exchanged, belong still, as before, to the house.

xi. The purchased estates given in exchange for house-properties of the patriarchate are to belong to the monasteries [founded by Nicon], but the patriarchal estates are to be restored to the house.

xii. The lesser monasteries taken and attached to the monastery of Voskresensk and to other monasteries of Nicon's foundation, are all, with their estates, to be as they were originally, and are to be subject, each of them, to the jurisdiction of the local bishop.

xiii. A partition of the estates and salt-pans between the different monasteries [of Nicon's foundation], showing which are to belong to each monastery.

From the full text of the original.

In A.M. 7175, A.D. 1667, Apr. —. In the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, the most holy œcumenical patriarchs Paisius &c., and Macarius &c., and the most holy Joasaph patriarch of Moscow &c., and the most reverend the metropolitans, archbishops, and bishops &c., assembled for the following cause:

Petitions have been presented to the tsar Alexis Michaelo-

vich &c., in past years at divers dates, by archimandrites, hegoumens, economes, kellars, and treasurers, and brethren, on account of the former estates of their monasteries, and salt-pans, and fisheries, and all manner of rights and properties, which the monk Nicon took when he was in the patriarchal chair, and after his leaving the chair, in exchange or without exchange, and from different dioceses, and attached them to the monasteries of his own foundation, the Iverskoy, the Krestnoy, and the Voskresensky, praying that the great hossoudar would be graciously pleased to command those properties to be restored to them and to their monasteries, and the lesser monasteries attached by Nicon to those three of his own foundation to belong, as before, each of them to its own local diocese. And the tsar &c. decreed that *the most holy patriarchs* &c. should judge of all this, *according to the sacred canons*, and make an order.

And we &c., accordingly, having read canon xxxiv. of the Apostles, running thus: 'Without their primate the bishops are to do nothing, except what it belongs to each to do in his own diocese; and the primate likewise without them is to do nothing, on account of that unity which is needful for all' (the gloss on this instances the selling or alienating of church-property &c.): can. xxvi. of Carthage on the same subject of selling church-property; and the gloss: and can. xxxiii. [enacting] the same rule for priests, who are not to alienate without the bishop; and the gloss: can. xii. of the Seventh œcumenical council, to the same purpose; and the gloss: can. vii. of the First and Second council: 'No bishop is to found monasteries *to the impoverishment of his see:* else the unfinished monastery is to be applied to some secular purpose, and the bishop suspended:' can. ii. of St. Cyril of Alexandria: the Novells of Justinian, title B:

[Having read all these] we by these canons also condemn the monk Nicon of having acted irregularly. *Even though* he petitioned the *great hossoudar* for permission, and obtained letters of grant for those estates, still this was in evasion of the above-cited *canons*, according to which without a synod of the rest of the bishops he could do nothing *of that kind*. And he could not without a synod exchange away estates belonging to the patriarchal house, or give such estates and monasteries away to belong to those monasteries of his own foundation, the Iverskoy, the Krestnoy, and the Voskresensky. But he, the monk Nicon,

did that in contravention of the sacred canons, and he *did not lay those canons* [as he ought to have done] *before the great hossoudar.*

And therefore those letters [*of the great hossoudar*] which he obtained *we* account as *null*, though in those letters there are written many words, and with imprecations, yet *uncanonically.* And as to those letters and the curses in them, *we* forgive and *loose from all bond* the *great hossoudar.*

But, for the monasteries which in the time of his patriarchate the monk Nicon founded and endowed *without the counsel of all the sacred synod, uncanonically*, that is, the Iverskoy, the Krestnoy, and the Voskresensky, *out of deference* to the great hossoudar *we* for the time to come recognise them as monasteries, and confirm them, receiving them into the number of monasteries canonically founded.

As regards the estates which the great hossoudar was graciously pleased to [grant or confirm to] those monasteries of his, the monk Nicon's, foundation, viz. the Iverskoy, the Krestnoy, and the Voskresensky, the great hossoudar shall be graciously pleased to give his letters to the same effect *over again*, as the Lord God shall inspire him.

But as regards the exchanged and purchased estates of the monk Nicon it is to be thus: The original estates of the house of the most holy Mother of God, and of the patriarchal house, which the monk Nicon took from the house of the Blessed Virgin, and from the see of Kolomna, and from different monasteries, in exchange or without exchange, and gave them to the Voskresensky and to other monasteries of his own foundation, shall revert to their former state, and shall belong, as originally, to the house of the Blessed Virgin, and to the house of the patriarchate. And the estates formerly belonging to the see of Kolomna shall revert to the see of Kolomna; and the estates formerly belonging to different monasteries shall be restored each to that monastery from which it was taken.

But those estates which by the grant of the great hossoudar were given to Nicon and attached to the monasteries of his foundation shall belong without change [or exchange] to the same monasteries; and each particular estate to such one of them as it shall be apportioned to on consideration.

But the purchased estates of the monk Nicon, which he gave in exchange for others to the house of the B.V., shall belong

without any exchange to that monastery of Nicon's foundation to which the estate taken in exchange for it by him was given, those taken by him in exchange being restored to the patriarchal house.

The monasteries which the monk Nicon arbitrarily took from other dioceses, and attached them with their estates to the Voskresensky &c., shall revert to their former dioceses and be under the local bishops as before, each monastery having free possession of its own estates.

And such monasteries as were founded by Nicon in different dioceses shall be subject to the local bishops.

But for those estates of the patriarchal house which by ukaz of Nicon, the late patriarch, the people under his prikaz, viz. the archimandrites, hegoumens, economes, kellars, treasurers, and brethren of his monasteries, of his own foundation, received and exchanged with the archimandrites, hegoumens, economes, &c. of other different monasteries, all those deeds of exchange are to be null and void.

The division and description of these monasteries and estates, specifying where each is situated, and to which monastery it is to belong, is as follows:

The grants of the tsar &c. of purchased estates and salt-pans to be possessed by the Iverskoy monastery, according to his imperial ukaz.

In the riding of Novgorod, in the Derevkaia piatina, the village (*selo*) of Valdai with these pogosts, Eglinsk, Kolotz, Nerechotz, and twenty hamlets (*derevnias*): and to the same selo and derevnias there belong 131 wastes, also a waste derevnia, and fisheries, and lakes, and all manner of rights and usufructs, as are enumerated in the registers. The selo Chavnitsi with its peasants. The riadok (*row* of houses) of Yajelbitskoy, and together with the same the slobodka and wastes. The riadok Edrovo, with its peasants, with wastes and pochinki, and with its lakes and fisheries, and two small streams. The pogost of Velikoporojsk with its peasants and the brick-kiln. A riadok at Beretsoff with its peasants. A riadok at Great Volochok with peasants and with *bobili* (peasants without land), and with the same riadok seven meadows. The pogost Petrovsky and Borisoglebskoy with peasants and bobili, and seven [church] wastes, with seven outlying meadows. The pogost Sieskoy Borovitskoy, and in the same the riadok Poterpieletz, with peasants. The

small selo Nizino on the Siasa, with four derevnias belonging to it, and two waste derevnias. The selo Vidropousk on the river Natvertsa, which in time past was the selo Yam, and with it, according to the registers, seventeen wastes; and with the same selo nineteen wastes which used to be let for obroks, and of unoccupied lands nineteen wastes and the half of a waste, and with waste land of Yam.

In the riding of Starorouss the pogost Kelomna and sixteen derevnias, and fifty-two wastes. The pogost Cherenchitsi, with the selo Shotovie, and four derevnias. The pogost Ramishevskoy, with the selo Parchini, and nineteen derevnias, with the half of a derevnia, and twenty-two wastes. In the same riding of Starorouss the pogost Petnoskoe, and thirty-seven derevnias and a half derevnia, and a hundred and nine wastes and the half of a waste, and of newly-attached two derevnias and half a waste, and three wastes. The pogost of Voskresensk with a newly-attached derevnia, and eighteen other derevnias, and a hundred and nine wastes. The pogost of Ephremovskoe, and seventeen derevnias, and two hundred and fifty-six wastes. In the same riding of Starorouss the pogost Chertilsky and a *vistavka*, and eight derevnias, and seventeen wastes. The pogost Slavitinsky, and selo, and twenty-seven derevnias, and a hundred and thirty-one wastes, and two seltsos. The pogost Doljensky, and twenty-one derevnias, and fifty-seven wastes. The pogost Drelensky, and two vistavkas (places for Expositions), twenty-seven derevnias, two hundred and twenty-one wastes. The pogost Sniejsky, a seltso, and six derevnias, and a hundred and two wastes.

In the riding of Rjeff the selo Schoeschovo and eleven derevnias, and thirteen wastes, and four lakes.

And in Moscow, in the Kitai-gorod, a house with a courtyard (a dvor) with stone or brick chambers. Also in Moscow a podvorie outside the city.

Also in Great Novgorod two houses with gardens.

Also in Torjok and in Tver two houses with gardens.

In the riding of Novgorod in the piatina of Derevtz the seltso which was formerly the derevnia of Rachin-most, and a great garden or orchard. The seltso Ploskoe, with derevnias: and with the same seltso and with the derevnias two wastes and three lakes, and fisheries in the river Volchoff, and an outlying meadow.

In the same riding of Novgorod, in the Zashegrinsky stan, what used to be the Shoumkovskaia sloboda, with its peasants, and arable lands, and fisheries, and other rights and properties.

In the riding of Kleen the seltso Schapovo, and with it three derevnias. In the same riding the derevnias Maximkovo, Yasenovo, and Dmitrovka.

In the riding of Moscow the priselok (small dependent selo) of Bogorodskoy.

In Starorouss six salt-pans with boilers, and reservoirs, and all the necessary establishments and conveniences for making the salt, and a house in Starorouss in connection with the same salt-works. Also in Starorouss five salt boileries leased (paying obrok), with all the establishments and apparatus for salt-boiling.

To the Krestnoy monastery.

In the ridings of Kargopol and Tourchasoff, the following volosts: Pokola; Chekouevskaia; Chinchlin-bor on the river Chodina; Polia on the same river; Moudiuga; Zaostrovskaia; Nakojaisk, from the higher end: the small volosts Korielskaia, which is above the rapids; Volgouda on the river Volgouda; and St. Peter's Zaporojsk: the volosts of Podporojie on the river Onega; Oust-rieki-Onegi on the Korelski side, on the shore of the sea; Vorzogori: the small volosts Nimenga, and Koushrieka, another on the river Tamitsa, and Birichevskaia. In the volost of Korotetz nine derevnias: the volost Piala with Kovkola; and the volost Vizenitsa.

To the monastery of Voskresensk.

In the riding of Moscow: In the Gorenova stan, the derevnia Andreeffskaia; and the selo Chernevo: In the Radounejsky stan the selo Ivanovskoe; the selo of Voskresensk, and two derevnias, viz. Kotelnikovo and Richkovo; the seltso Asaourovo, and two derevnias; the selo Mikoulino, and the derevnia Retkino; the derevnia Tichonkova; the derevnia Seletz; the selo of Kashino; also the small selo (*seltso*) which is called Bounkovo, and the third part of the waste called Phophonkova: the seltso Petrovskoe; the selo Rojestvennoe; the derevnias Dorna, Kotioureva, and Talitsi; the seltsos Kniajie and Novoe; the derevnia Khoutsoueva.

In the riding of Volotsk the waste Sereda; and Stratilatskaia, with other wastes.

In the riding of Riazan half of the selo Riadenoka.

In the riding of Dmitroff, in the Moushkavsky stan the seltso Seliso, with its wastes.

In the riding of Novgorod, in the piatina of Derevsk, in the pogost of Velevsk on the lake Velie, the derevnias Gourileva, Perevoloka, Podberejie; the lake Velie, and the lake Oukleinoe.

In the riding of Dmitroff, in the Berendeyefsky stan, half the derevnia of Klotisheva, and half that of Pogorielie.

In the riding of Zvenigorod, the seltso Yourkino; the derevnia Kozloborodovo.

In the riding of Pereslavsk, the seltso Laurovo, and the derevnia Rodiontsova.

In the riding of Vladimir, Jerebey in the selo Krasnoe.

In the riding of Rouzk, the selo Kazanovo, with its derevnias.

In the riding of Bielozersk, the pogost Bogoslovskoy; and Jerebey in the selo Bogoyavlensko, with its derevnias; also in the volost of Cherepoff what used to be the seltso Koltovskoe, with its wastes.

In the riding of Kourmish, the selo Antonovo; and the derevnia Yourieva, and the seltso Bikovka.

In the riding of Rouzk, the seltso Ednevo; and in Kamski two salt-pans, the gift of the great hossoudar, producing at the rate of 2000 rubles yearly.

And then the remaining signatures of the archimandrites, the rest having signed first on the tops of the leaves.

Appendix to the above.

[Reference has been made above to a schedule of certain sales and exchanges of church lands and properties made by Nicon in time past for reasons of convenience, which now, *as if uncanonical*, and in spite of the *tsar's* having concurred in them, are disallowed by the most holy œcumenical patriarchs, that is, rather by the council of the boyars. From the schedule so alluded to, what follows is given (the beginning of the document is lost):

In the year 7161 (A.D. 1652-1653) there were *exchanged* of estates belonging to the *house of the* patriarch in the riding of Moscow the selo Pokrovsk, and that of Pechorka; in the riding of Kolomna the selo Biserovo with its wastes, amounting of arable land to 508 chetverts; also in the riding of Kolomna 32 houses of peasants [were transferred] *to* the Bogoyavlensky monastery (of the Theophany) which is on the Moskva behind the Vietoshni riad; and *from* that monastery there were taken in exchange to

the house of the most holy Mother of God (*i.e.* to the cathedral of the Assumption at Moscow) in the same riding of Moscow the selo Veliaminovo, now called Vladikino, of arable land 373 chetverts, and of peasants 14 houses.

In A.M. 7162 (A.D. 1653-1654) there was given to the Iverskoy monastery, the foundation of the most holy Nicon the patriarch, from his house estates, the selo Goritsi in the riding of Kashina; also the selo Stoianetz and the derevnia attached to it called Rousiloff, and 39 houses, 81 wastes, of arable land 2244 chetverts, and of peasants 247 houses: and to the house of the B. Virgin in lieu of these house estates the most holy Nicon the patriarch [transferred] the selo Antonovo and the derevnia Yourievka in the riding of Kourmish which the great hossoudar had granted to him; also the seltso Biskovka which he had purchased of Artemius Otbaloff, of arable land 1338 chetverts, and of peasants 130 houses. And now from that exchanged estate there have been taken away to the crown villages (selos) of the great hossoudar, or inquisitors appointed to judge have awarded to petitioners (*i.e.* to claimants suing), about 50 families of the peasants.

In the same year the most holy Nicon the patriarch petitioned the great hossoudar the tsar &c. to accept his house estates in the riding of Zvenigorod, the villages Dmitrovsko and Oksinino with their hamlets, counting 89 houses of peasants. In the same year there was exchanged to the great hossoudar for the crown volost (or liberty) of Lipetzko in the riding of Kashira the house estate of the village Selna on the river Oka with its fisheries, of arable land 280 chetverts, of peasants 85 houses; and in lieu of that estate the great hossoudar granted to the house of the B. Virgin from his crown villages, in the riding of Moscow, the selo of Ozersk and that of Bieloi-Rast with their derevnias and wastes, of arable land 230 chetverts, and of land ploughed up or covered with wood 3581 chetverts, of peasants 76 horses.

In 7163 (A.D. 1654-5) the great hossoudar &c. granted to the house of the B. Virgin in the riding of Dvina in Ponosi and in Lokta fisheries, and of peasant fishermen 9 houses, and of newly-baptised Lopars, also fishermen, 62 families. And in the year 7165 (A.D. 1656-1657) these fisheries and peasants were given by the most holy patriarch Nicon to the Krestnoy and the

Voskresensk monasteries of his own foundation. But the obroks paid from them to the treasury of the house of the patriarchate were at the rate of 430 rubles in money, and 100 poods of salmon yearly; and to the house in lieu of that property there was given nothing.

In the year 7164 (A.D. 1655-6) there was alienated in exchange to the great hossoudar, to his crown villages, a house estate in the riding of Moscow, the selo Stefanofsko on the river Iskra, with its wastes, of arable land 114 chetverts, of peasants 25 houses; and in lieu thereof the great hossoudar granted to the house of the B. Virgin from his crown villages in the same riding of Moscow the selo Cherkizovo and the derevnia Shemiakina with their wastes, and half the seltso Nikolskoy, of arable land 326 chetverts all but half an osmina, and of peasants 26 houses. And that selo of Cherkizovo and the derevnia Shemiakina with its wastes the most holy patriarch Nicon gave to the Iverskoy monastery of his own foundation. But for the house in lieu thereof he purchased in the same riding of Moscow the estate of Gregorieff, the selo Kouzaieff, of arable land 227 chetverts and an osmina, of peasants 9 houses; and half of the village Nikolskoy he gave also to the house. In it there were 44 houses of peasants.

In the year 7165 (A.D. 1656-1657) there was alienated by exchange the house estate the derevnia Posnikova in the riding of Moscow and 14 wastes, of arable land 364 chetverts, of peasants 15 houses; which were made over to the protopope and the brethren of the sobor of the Archangel in lieu of their collegiate estate, which the most holy patriarch Nicon took to build his monastery of Voskresensk upon. And to the house of the patriarchate he gave in compensation his own estate of Setsonovo, which he had bought in the riding of Moscow, having of arable land 200 chetverts, and of peasants 10 houses; but now it is desolate.

In the year 7166 (A.D. 1657-8) the most holy Nicon took for the Voskresensky monastery of his own foundation 16 wastes belonging to the house in the riding of Dmitrofsk on the river Iskra, and the waste Rechinovo with arable waste land, 190 chetverts; and to the house in lieu thereof there was nothing given.

In the same year there was exchanged the house estate of the selo Romanovskoe in the riding of Pereyaslaff Zaliessky with

its derevnias and with its wastes, which were made over to the monastery of Troitsa of St. Sergius, there being of arable land 1460 chetverts, and of peasants 72 houses; and from the Troitsa monastery there was taken in exchange for the same the estate of the selo Rojestvennoe in the riding of Dmitroff with its derevnias and its wastes for the monastery of Voskresensk. But to the house in lieu of the selo Romanovskoe the most holy patriarch ordered to be given in the riding of Kolomna from the episcopal estates the selo Gorodische with its derevnias, having of arable land 1746 chetverts, and of peasants 115 houses. But the title-deeds to that estate in Kolomna he did not give.

In the same year there was alienated by exchange the house estate the selo Khliadbovo in the riding of Moscow with its wastes, of arable land 227 chetverts and an osmina, of peasants 16 houses, to become the house estate of the Novinsky monastery; and from the Novinsky monastery the most holy patriarch took for the monastery of Voskresensk of his own foundation the selo Telepnovo in the riding of Rouzk with its wastes, of arable land 785 chetverts, and of peasants 30 houses But for the patriarchal house instead thereof the most holy patriarch Nicon bought of the okolnik prince Youry Niketich Bariatinsky in the riding of Vladimir Jerebey, in the selo Krasno. of arable land 170 chetverts, and of peasants 12 houses. But the title-deeds of that purchased estate he gave not to the house.

In the same year the most holy Nicon bought for his own foundation at Voskresensk an estate in the riding of Moscow from the widow Matrona, who had been the wife of Nikephor Pleschcëff, viz. the selo Kotereva; and for that estate 500 silver rubles in money were paid from the house-revenues of the patriarchal palace.

In the year 7161 (A.D. 1655-1656) there was sent to the riding of Kodopol, to the Krestnoy monastery, the secretary Ivan Kokosheheff, and with him there was sent from the prikaz of the patriarchal palace, by his (Nicon's) ukaz, to the Krestnoy monastery money for the buildings, which had been collected from the people belonging to the house estates of the monastery subject to the payment of obrok, 1433 rubles, 3 altines, and 2 dengi. And there is now a suit to recover that money in the *Monastery prikaz*, in the palata (the krestovaia).

Also in the patriarchal *Kazenni prikaz* in the book of the

out-goings there is this entry: 'By ukaz of the most holy patriarch Nicon there was issued from the treasury of the patriarchal house, for all manner of expenses connected with the foundation of his monastery of Voskresensk, 4895 rubles, 4 altines and a half, and 6 dengi.' But he, the most holy patriarch Nicon, ordered that money to be reckoned [and set down] as issued from his patriarchal *cell* (his personal) treasury, into which goes whatever is given him by the great hossoudar on festivals; and that money in the year 7166 (A.D. 1657-1658) was not really paid out from the patriarchal *personal* treasury.

In the same year 7166 (A.D. 1657-1658), when the most holy patriarch Nicon went from Moscow to the monastery at Voskresensk, abandoning the patriarchate, he took with him of the house money from the *Kazenni prikaz* 2000 rubles in money, and from the *Palatni prikaz* 1000.

And in the year 7167 (A.D. 1658-1659) by ukaz of the great hossoudar, after correspondence with the prikaz of the great hossoudar for secret service, there were taken from the house treasury [of the patriarchate] 2000 rubles; and the boyar prince Al. Nik. Troubetskoy certified by a minute that those moneys were sent from the prikaz *for secret service* to the patriarch Nicon].

Another list of the chapters only, or separate tomes of the synod of A.D. 1667, *giving them in a different order.*

A.M. 7177 [7175], May 1, A.D. 1667. List of the chapters of the Exposition made by the most holy œcumenical patriarchs Kyr Paisius &c. of Alexandria, and Kyr Macarius &c. of Antioch, and the great hospodin the most holy patriarch Joasaph of Moscow and all Russia, and by the most reverend the metropolitans and archbishops and bishops, and all the sacred synod.

Chapter I. Tome of the sacred synod assembled in Moscow, that is, a roll, and statement of the matters; viz. for what causes the synod was assembled; and what judgments they laid down; and how they confirmed the same by the subscriptions of their hands, the hands, that is, of the most holy patriarchs and the most reverend metropolitans, archbishops, and bishops, and archimandrites and hegoumens. [This is the same as chapter I. above.]

Chapter II. Canons which were proposed to the synod by the most blessed and most holy Kyr Paisius &c. and Kyr Macarius &c., for the correction of some necessary ecclesiastical

matters, under the hands of the most holy œcumenical patriarchs, and of the great hospodin the most holy Joasaph patriarch of Moscow &c., and of the most reverend metropolitans, archbishops, and bishops, and of the archimandrites and hegoumens. Written in a folio cahier on twenty-one leaves. [This is the same as chapter II. above, down to § xxxvi. incl.]

Chapter III. Constitution of the most holy patriarchs Paisius &c., Macarius &c., and Joasaph &c., and the most reverend metropolitans, archbishops, and bishops, and archimandrites and hegoumens. Written in one cahier, in folio. [Same as chapter VIII. above.]

Chapter IV. Questions addressed by the most holy Joasaph patriarch of Moscow &c., and by the most reverend the Russian metropolitans, archbishops, and bishops, to the most holy œcumenical patriarchs Paisius &c. and Macarius &c., and the answers of the same patriarchs. Question i. begins thus: 'On the day of Pentecost, of the descent of the Holy Ghost, when they read those prayers which are said kneeling,' &c. Under the hands of the œcumenical patriarchs, and the great hospodin the most holy patriarch Joasaph &c., and the most reverend the metropolitans, archbishops, and bishops, and the archimandrites and hegoumens. Written in a cahier, on folio, in all ten leaves. [This is chapter VII. above.]

Chapter V. An explanation by the most blessed and most holy patriarchs Kyr Paisius &c. and Kyr Macarius &c., respecting the *Alleluia*; and respecting the sign of the honourable and life-giving cross, viz. of the right way of putting together the fingers; and of the correction of the holy Creed; and of the Prayer to Jesus, &c. Under the hands of the three patriarchs, and the metropolitans, archbishops, and bishops, and the archimandrites and hegoumens. A cahier in folio. [The same as chapter III. above.]

Chapter VI. Questions proposed to the two most holy œcumenical patriarchs, Paisius &c. and Macarius &c., concerning the judgment of the patriarch Nicon of the communion of robbers and other murderers in the sacred mysteries. Under the hands of the two most holy œcumenical patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch. [The same as chapter IV. above.]

Chapter VII. Constitutions of the holy council held in the days of the most pacific tsar &c. Alexis Michaelovich, A.D. 1667, the fifth year of the indiction; concerning widower popes. Under

the hands of all the three most holy patriarchs, Kyr Paisius &c., Kyr Macarius &c., and the great hospodin the most holy Joasaph &c., and of the most reverend the metropolitans and archimandrites and hegoumens. Written on ten leaves, folio. [The same as chapter IX. above.]

Chapter VIII. An Instruction respecting the synod held in A.M. 7059 (A.D. 1551), in the reign of the tsar John IV. Basilievich &c.; respecting the Alleluia; and respecting the Prayer to Jesus. Under the hands of the three patriarchs and the most reverend the metropolitans, archbishops, and bishops, and the archimandrites and hegoumens. Written on ten leaves, folio. [The same as chapter X. above.]

Chapter IX. Three cahiers with eighteen leaves of writing, folio, respecting the separation of the estates of the Iverskoy, Krestnoy, and Voskresensky monasteries. Under the hands of the same three patriarchs. [The same as chapter XI. above.]

Chapter X. An exposition of the sacred synod concerning the baptism and the correction of those who from the Latins and from other different sects come to the faith. Written on sixteen leaves, folio. Under the hands of the three patriarchs and of the metropolitans, archbishops, and bishops, and of the archimandrites and hegoumens. [The same as chapter VI. above.]

Chapter XI. Of the spiritual jurisdiction; and of the representation on icons of the Lord of Sabaoth; and of the monastic order; and of the saints the thaumaturges of Moscow; and of widower popes and deacons: and of popes and deacons going from one church to another.

[Note that nothing is said here about signatures, while they are distinctly mentioned to each of the other chapters. The heads here are those of the latter part of chapter IV. above, beginning from its § xxxvii., which is the first of the subtitle: 'Of the spiritual jurisdiction.' But here 'the monastic order' (which is a subtitle) is improperly mentioned before, instead of after, the icons and white klobouks of the sainted metropolitans of Moscow. And there is nothing in chapter II. above about 'widower popes and deacons.']

Chapter XII. The order of the divine liturgy of our holy fathers, John Chrysostom and Basil the Great, explained. Written from the dictation of the most holy Athanasius Patellarius, ex-patriarch of C.P., who gave and delivered it by word

of mouth when he was in the capital city of Moscow in A.M. 7161 (A.D. 1653). Attested in the same city of Moscow by the most holy œcumenical patriarchs Paisius &c. and Macarius &c., under their hands. [This is the same as chapter V. above.]

XXV.

Referring to pp. 40, 74, 169, 191, 193, 282, *and other places where mention is made of the boyars of the council collectively, or where individuals of them are named.*

Nicon, in the letter which he wrote to Paisius Ligarides on first hearing of his arrival at Moscow in 1662 (p. 51), and in that which he wrote towards the end of 1665 to the patriarch Dionysius of C.P. (p. 381), relates how the tsar had changed in his conduct for the worse, and only alludes slightly, through a reference to the history of Rehoboam, to the evil influence of the boyars. But in the letters written by Athanasius metropolitan of Iconium to Nicon in 1664 and 1665, and in Nicon's answers to them, the boyars only are spoken of. 'I was sent,' Athanasius writes, 'for the sake of a pacification *with the boyars* . . . . and so they sent me into imprisonment,' &c. And Nicon: 'What a war do not *those evil men* make upon me now for seven years, and say all that they say falsely!' And, in reference to a certain book 'On the judgment of bishops,' which he was sorry to have lost, he writes: 'At the time of my departure I left it at Moscow with the rest of the books and other property: and by ukaz of the tsar *the boyars* broke open all the locks, and took away whatever they pleased: and that book too they took.' p. 368. And the patriarch Nectarius of Jerusalem, writing in 1664 to the tsar, speaks of the contention between the patriarch Nicon '*and his adversaries*:' and this form of expression he may have learned from the tsar himself, for he writes of the tsar's envoy, the Greek deacon Meletius, thus: 'And he *showed*[47] *me* also a certain short writing, as a memorandum given him, adjuring him by God to tell us all that he knows about Kyr Nicon *and his adversaries*.' p. 351. And the *treason* of the boyar Nikita Zinzin, when, feigning a secret commission from the tsar, he

[47] Solovieff quotes some words from a similar minute of instructions given to the same Meletius for his second mission, which also, like the first, he was no doubt *directed to show*, that so these words might be seen and noticed: 'and thou, Meletius, when thou art with the œcumenical patriarchs, speak no superfluous words about the patriarch Nicon, but only justice.' See p. 360.

wrote in Dec. 1664 to Nicon to return to Moscow, consisted not only in having falsely used the tsar's name, but also and still more in this, that he had gone about 'to imbroil the tsar with the council and with all the empire.'

The boyars, then, rather than the tsar being the principals in the struggle (though the tsar too, certainly, had his share in it, and was not merely passive), and the boyars having been the first to take up and to employ Ligarides, who afterwards contrived and managed all that was done for the removal of Nicon, it will not be out of place to subjoin here some account of those men who filled the chief offices at Moscow from the beginning of 1662 (the year in which Ligarides came thither) to the end of 1666 or to Easter in 1667 (where he ends his history). Our list is made out from the more extensive lists published in the '*Drevnaia Russkaia Bibliotheca*.'

Between the end of 1661 and the 1st Dec. 1666 there had died of the *boyars* and *dvoretskoys* (whom as identical in rank we shall here include under the first name) eight.

1. In 1662 died *Boris Iv. Morozoff*, first preceptor, and afterwards brother-in-law to the tsar. He was not himself by any means incorrupt, any more than the Streshneffs and their brother-in-law Iv. Paul. Matiushkin, who were the tsar's nearest relatives through his mother: but it was the double marriage arranged by him in 1647, which, by bringing the Miloslafskys with their needy connections into power, gave a great and lasting predominance to rapacity and corruption. Those most guilty may have been cowed indeed somewhat by the popular rising at Moscow[48] in 1648; they may have been held in check for a time by the influence of Nicon;[49] they may have trembled in 1662, when the mob came to Kolomensk (from which fright, Solovieff writes, the tsaritsa did not entirely recover for a year, and the tsar long retained his anger against Elia Dan. Miloslafsky, and displaced for a time Ivan Paul. Matiushkin from his prikaz); they may have been alarmed in Dec. 1664, when Nicon returned in the night to Moscow, at the thought of a possible reconciliation between him and the tsar: but to put them down

[48] See the *Travels of Macarius*, &c. p. 68, 137, 138; and the appendix from the work of Olearius, giving an account of the popular risings of 1648 and 1650, and showing that the tsar had not really killed either '*all*' or '*most of those iniquitous voivodes and boyars*,' who caused trouble at the beginning of his reign.

[49] Ib. p. 68, 69, 71, 111, 151, 166.

effectually, to disgrace and punish them, was what the tsar never had the will nor perhaps the courage to attempt. But to return to Morozoff: he seems to have been in a sinking state for two years or more before his death: and the tsar, after visiting him in his own house (the only time that he ever so visited a subject), wrote to Nicon, then at Voskresensk, as in the name of Morozoff, to ask forgiveness if in anything he had wronged him. Nicon replied that he knew of nothing to forgive; if there *was* anything, he forgave it; but he had experienced from Morozoff only kindness and goodwill. See *Travels of Macarius*, p. 100.

2. Also in 1662 there died the boyar Gleb Iv. Morozoff, brother of the preceding.

3. In 1663 the Prince *Alexis Nik. Troubetzkoy:* he held the *Sibirski* prikaz 1646-1663. See p. 42, 386.

4. Also in 1663 *Iv. Andr. Miloslafsky*, cr. okolnik in 1648, and boyar in 1657: he was one of those against whom the mob were enraged in 1662.

5. In 1664 pr. Ivan Ivan. Lobanoff-Rostofsky, created okolnik in A.D. 1649, boyar in 1661.

6. In 1665 pr. Theod. Theod. Volkonsky.

7. Also in 1665 (at the beginning of the year) Nikita Al. Ziuzin was disgraced and exiled. See p. 396; and *Travels of Macarius*, p. 69, 329.

8. In 1666 Simeon Lucianovich Streshneff; he was kraichi in 1646, ok. 1651, b. 1655: he presided in the *Oustiojskaia Chet.* (office for the province or section of Oustiog) 1657-1666, and in the *Litovski* pr. 1663-1666. See p. 58, 74, 398; and the *Replies of Nicon*, p. 16, 668.

Of the okolniks there had died:

1. In 1662 Procop. Theod. Socovnin, cr. 1650.

2. In 1662 Iv. Athan. Gavreneff, cr. doumni dvorianin in 1651, and ok. in 1655: he held the *Rozriadni*[50] prikaz from the year 1643 to 1662.

3. In 1662 Tim. Iv. Stcherbatoff, cr. 1655.

4. In 1663 Iv. Andr. Miloslafsky, cr. 1648: he held the *Yamski* pr. (of the posts) 1650-1663.

[50] The highest of the prikazes till 1692, when the Posolski pr. took precedence of it. It was an office and court for official requests, and dispositions: it appointed to all the nobles of the lower ranks up to stolniks their places for missions and duties, and punished them by imprisonments and stripes. It was generally presided over by doumnie dinki (*i.e.* secretaries of the council).

5. In 1664 pr. Andr. Theod. Litvinoff Mosalskoy, cr. 1646.

6. In 1664 pr. Theod. Theod. Dolgorouky, cr. 1655.

7. In 1664 Theod. Kouzm. Eleazaroff, cr. yaselnik in 1652, doumni dvorianin 1653, ok. 1655: he had directed the *Pomiestni* pr. from 1654.

Boyars living 1st Dec. 1666.

1. Prince Bor. Alex. Repnin, already a boyar in 1646, held the *Razboini* pr. (criminal court) 1654-1661, died 1670.

2. Prince *Nikita Iv. Odoefsky*, already boyar in 1646, compiled the Code of 1648, 1649: presided in the *Kazanski dvoretz* (office for the palace and kingdom of Kazan) 1641-1686, and in the *Sibirski* pr. 1644-1646: after death of Elia Dan. Miloslafsky in 1668 succeeded him in the three prikazes *Bolshoi Kazni* (great or public treasury), *Inozemski* (office for aliens), and *Reitarski* (for the cavalry), and held them till 1671: also he held the *Aptekarski* pr. (lit. 'the apothecary office,' but in a wider sense than the word bears in English) from 1678 (having with him in it the *Kraichi s' poutiem* pr. Bas. Theod. Odoefsky, who in 1686 had the *Dvortsovoi soudni* pr. (the judicial prikaz of the palace), after the death of Bogdan Matv. Khitroff). See p. 77, 169, 282, 389, 391, 394. And the *Replies* &c. of Nicon, p. 354, 586, 668.

3. Mich. Mich. Soltikoff, already boyar in 1646: he d. 1672.

4. *Pr. Greg. Koud. Cherkassky*, cr. boyar in 1646. Paisius names him as present when Nicon appeared before the synod on the 1st Dec. 1666, but he seems to have died before the end of that year. See p. 169.

5. Iv. Iv. Lvoff Soltikoff, cr. 1646, d. 1671.

6. *Elia Dan. Miloslafsky*, whose eldest daughter the tsar married in 1647, Boris Morozoff marrying her younger sister a week later. Cr. ok. and b. 1648 (in the summer of which year the rapacity and injustice of those advanced or protected by Morozoff already produced a popular rising, as similar abuses did again in 1662). He held the *Reitarski* pr. and the *Streletski* pr. (office of the streltsi, *i.e.* archers and musketeers, which last Bor. Morozoff had held from 1646 to 1651, and in which in 1633 *Serge Matveyeff* was a diak) from 1651 till his death in 1668: also the pr. *Stolovich i Schetnich diel* (office of accounts) 1657 to 1668, and three other prikazes which had been held by Morozoff from

1651 to his death in 1662, viz. the *Aptekarski, Bolshoi Kazni*, and *Inozemski*, from 1662 to 1668.

7. Pr. Mich. Petr. Pronsky, cr. 1648, lived over 1676: he held the *Poushkarski* pr. (the artillery) from 14 June 1648 (after the okolnik Peter Tichon. Trachanioutoff had been given up to the enraged people and executed) till he was sent to Astrachan in 1651.

8. *Pr. Youry Alex. Dolgorouky*, cr. 1649: lived over 1676: he held the *Poushkarski* pr. 1651-1654, and again 1657-1662: in 1666 he was over the *Kazenni dvor* (treasury), which the kaznachey Narbekoff had had from 1664, and which Narbekoff had again in 1668. He took the *Smolenski* pr. and the *Oustiojskaia Chet.* in 1677. See p. 88, 169.

9. Pr. Greg. Sim. Kourakin, cr. 1652: he had the *Novgorodskoi Rozriad* in 1659.

10. Pr. Iv. Petr. Pronsky, cr. 1652: d. after 1676.

11. Bas. Bas. Sheremetieff, cr. 1653, taken prisoner in 1661, and still a prisoner in the Crimea in 1669.

12. Pr. Iv. Andr. Khilkoff, cr. ok. 1649, b. 1655: he died some time after 1676.

13. Pr. Bas. Greg. junior Romodanofsky, cr. ok. 1646, b. 1655, d. 1671: held the *Chelobitni* pr. (of private petitions and suits) 1651, and the *Poushkarski* pr. 1654-1657, and again 1662-1665 (when he was sent to Novgorod), and again 1666-1671.

14. Pet. Bas. Sheremetieff, cr. 1657, d. 1686.

15. Pr. *Iv. Sim. Prozorofsky*, cr. 1657; sat in the *Vladimirski Soudni* pr. (judicial prikaz for the principality of Vladimir) 1665-1668: slain by Stenka Razin in 1670. See p. 169.

16. Pr. Iv. Iv. Romodanofsky, cr. ok. 1648, b. 1657, d. 1671.

17. *Pet. Mich. Soltikoff*, cr. *kraichi* and ok. 1648, b. 1659, outlived 1676. Over the *Galitskaia Chet.* (for the province or section of Galitz) 1663-1668, and over the *Vladimirskaia Chetv.* and the *Malorossiski* pr. (for Little Russia) 1663-1669 (when this was put under Artemon Serg. Matveyeff, then a stolnik and polkovnik): over the *Bolshoi Kazni* pr. 1671-1678. It is implied by a story which will be found farther on, that he was at the head of the Smolenski prikaz for three years or more, before the 15th June 1667. See p. 169.

18. Pr. Iv. Bor. Repnin, cr. 1659, outlived 1676: he had the *Chelobitni* pr. and the *Yamski* pr. in 1670, the *Pomiestni* pr. (for

estates granted to be held of the crown for service) 1677, and the *Sibirski* 1680-1686.

19. Pr. Iv. Andr. Khovianskoy, cr. 1659: he was respected by the rioters of 1662 when they were enraged against Elia Dan. and Iv. Mich. Miloslafsky, and Iv. Paul. Matiushkin, and Simeon Luc. Streshneff: he sat in the *Chelobitni* pr. 1665-1666, and again 1668-1670, and in the *Yamski* pr. 1665, and again 1668-1670.

20. Pr. The. The. Kourakin, cr. 1660, outlived 1676.

21. Pr. *Yak. Nik. Odoefsky*, cr. 1663, outlived 1676. See above at p. 112.

22. Pr. Iv. Al. Vorotinsky, cr. 1664, outlived 1676.

23. Pr. Al. Andr. Golitsin, cr. 1664, outlived 1676.

24. *Pr. Youry Iv. Romodanofsky*, cr. 1665, outlived 1676. See p. 53, 385.

25. Pr. Greg. Greg. Romodanofsky, cr. 1665, d. after 1676.

26. The hetman of the Zaporog Kozaks, Iv. Mart. Briuchovetsky, who came to Moscow in the autumn of 1665, and married a daughter of the ok. pr. Dmitri Al. Dolgorouky; but he soon fell away from his allegiance: cr. 1666.

Okolniks living 1st Dec. 1666.

1. *Bogdan Matv. Khitroff*, cr. 1647, boyar 1667, d. 1678. He was placed over the *Zemski Dvor* (police court) in 1651 (within two years after Leonti Step. Pleshcheëff had been given up to the enraged people and put to death for his misconduct in the same prikaz): he sat in it till 1657. From 1654 to 1665 he had the Novaia Chet.; the *Oroujeynaia Palata* (the armory) from 1661 to 1678 (having in 1666 his son the stolnik Iv. Bogdanovich with him); he had the prikaz *Lieflandskich Diel* (for the affairs of Livonia) in 1665 and 1666, and the *Bolshoi Dvoretz* (the office and court of the great palace) and the *Dvortsovoi Soudni* pr. (the judicial prikaz of the palace) from 1665, having with him his son the stolnik above mentioned also in the *Bolshoi Dvoretz*, to which, and so to him, all the business of the *Monastirski* pr. (the office and court for the affairs of the monasteries and the clergy) was transferred in 1677. At that time he had with him the ok. Alex. Sebast. Khitroff (who in 1671 had the *Smolenski* prikaz, and the *Oustiojskaia Chetv.* till 1677). See p. 41, 52, 114, 116, 169, 347, 384.

2. Theod. Bas. Boutourlin, cr. 1650, d. 1673.

3. Bas. Alex. Choglodeff, cr. 1650, d. in 1669 at Olonetz.

4. Pr. Dmitri Alex. Dolgorouky, cr. 1651, boyar in A.D. 1671: he died in A.D. 1674.

5. Pr. Pet. Alex. Dolgorouky, cr. 1653, sat in the *Monastirski* pr. 1668, d. 1669.

6. Pr. Bor. Iv. Troekouroff, cr. 1654, boyar 1673, d. 1674: he held the *Razboini* pr. 1661-1663 with El. Kouzm. Bezobrazoff. His son Iv. Borisovich succeeded Odoefsky in the *Inozemski* pr. and held it from 1671 to 1674; also the *Reitarski* pr. 1671-1678; and the *Pomiestni* pr. in 1686.

7. Iv. Theod. senior Streshneff, cr. 1654, had the *Chelobitni* pr. 1657-1661, and the *Monastirski* pr. 1660-1663.

8. Sim. Artemon. Ismaeloff, cr. 1655, d. 1674.

9. Pr. Dan. Step. Gagin, cr. 1655; over the *Monastirski* pr. 1657-1660; had the *Razboini* pr. from 1663 (with El. Kouzm. Bezobrazoff till Bezobrazoff was ordered to sit in the *patriarchal Rozriad, i.e.* the *patriarchal* office and court for *ecclesiastical* applications and dispositions) till 1668.

10. Iv. Theod. junior Streshneff, cr. 1656, boyar in 1676.

11. Theod. Mich. Rtischeff: on the death of his father Mich. Al., who had been postelnik from 1650 to 1656, he became postelnik, but was in the same year made okolnik, and Greg. Iv. Rtischeff, who had been strapchi before from 1650, succeeded him as postelnik: he presided in the *Dvortsovoi Soudni* pr. 1657-1665, and in the *Bolshoi Dvoretz* 1662-1665.

Theodore Mich. Rtischeff presided also in the *Masterskaia Palata*; and he had the credit of having suggested to the tsar the expedient of coining copper kopecks and rubles to have the same legal value as silver (see the *Travels of Macarius*, p. 164). These *tokens* went without depreciation for two years or more; but from Sept. 1658 they began to fall in value, and fell more and more, till in 1663 twelve of the copper rubles were worth only one ruble silver: and this depreciation, together with the corruption and rapacity of some of the chief officers of state, caused in July 1662 disturbances at Moscow which threatened to renew the scenes of 1648. The rioters demanded that Elia Dan. and Ivan Mich. Miloslafsky (Ivan Paul. Matiushkin too was equally obnoxious), Theodore Mich. Rtischeff, and others should be given up and punished as traitors. They went out tumultuously to Kolomensk, where the tsar then was with his

family (and the two Miloslafskys were with him), and meeting by the way the boyar Simeon Lucian. Streshneff, they fell upon him with bludgeons, and he with difficulty escaped from them across the river. In 1648 it was only by the prudence of Niketa Ivan. Romanoff and some timely concessions that the people were pacified; but in 1662, having troops with him at Kolomensk, the tsar ordered them to charge the disorderly but unarmed mob, which fled in all directions. Some seven thousand or more were roughly handled, bruised, and wounded, besides a hundred who were drowned in the river. Those who had been most prominent had hands, feet, or noses cut off, and were exiled to distant places. At length the copper money was suppressed; and from 15th June 1663 the silver currency was restored (Solovieff's *History*, vol. xi. p. 271).

12. Mich. Mich. Babarikin, cr. 1656: he presided in three prikazes, viz. the *Denejnago Diela* (of the mint), the *Denejnago Sboroa* (for the collection of money imposts), and the *Bolshoi Prichod* (great revenue office), from 1663 to 1668.

13. *Rodion Matv. Streshneff*, cr. 1657, boyar in 1676: he presided in the *Bolshoi Prichod* 1661-1663, and in the *Sibirski* pr. 1663-1678 (having succeeded in it to pr. Alex. Nik. Troubetskoy). See p. 77, 169, 395; and *Replies of Nicon &c.*, p. 586.

14. Bas. Mich. Eropkin, cr. dounmi dvorianin 1655, ok. 1657, d. 1667. He presided in the *Masterskaia Palata* (office for arts and manufactures, artisans, &c.) of the tsaritsa 1663-1666.

15. Pr. Nich. Iv. Lobanoff-Rostofsky, cr. 1658.

16. Bas. Sim. Volhinsky, cr. 1658, boyar 1676.

17. Pr. Iv. Dmitr. Pojarsky, cr. 1658, d. 1668: he had the *Chelobitni* pr. with Miloslafsky in 1662; the pr. *Denejnoi Razdachi* (money issue) 1662, 1663; the *Polonianichni* pr. (for prisoners of war) 1663; the *Moskofski Soudni* pr. (the Moscow judicial prikaz) 1665, 1666; and the *Razboini* pr. 1668-1686.

18. Iv. Mich. Miloslafsky, cr. 1658, boyar 1676: he had the *Chelobitni* pr. 1661; the *Reitarski* pr. 1678-1680, and the *Bolshoi Kazni* pr. in 1678.

19. Mich. Sim. Volhinsky, cr. 1659, d. 1669: he had the *Chelobitni* pr. in 1661; and when he was sent on service 11th Oct. he was replaced there by the ok. Iv. Mich. Miloslafsky till

1666: he held the *Inozemski* pr. 1678, and the *Novaia Chet.* (new section) 1677-1686.

20. Pr. Pet. Sim. Ourousoff, cr. kraichi 1659, and boyar in 1676.

21. Osip Iv. Tscherbatoff, cr. 1660, d. 1667.

22. *Osip Iv. Soukin*, cr. 1661, d. 1669: he held the *Chelobitni* pr. in 1666, and between 1663 and 1668 (when the ok. Bas. Sim. Volhinsky was sent to Sweden) the *Polonianichni* pr. See the *Replies of Nicon*, p. 584, 598.

23. Pr. Iv. Petr. Bariatinsky, cr. 1662, boyar 1676. Over the *Denejnago Diela* pr. from 1663, and over the *Monastirski* pr. 1666-1668.

24. Pr. Greg. Athan. Volkonsky, cr. 1662.

25. Pr. Youry Nik. Bariatinsky, cr. 1664, boyar 1671: he was in the *Monastirski* pr. 1666-1668, and was succeeded there by the doumni dvorianin Zabourofsky.

26. Pr. Nich. Yak. Lvoff, cr. 1664: he was in the *Chelobitni* pr. with the boyar pr. Iv. Andr. Khovianskoy in 1665; and he presided in the *Novaia Chet.* 1665-1666. In 1669 he became a monk.

27. Theod. Yak. Miloslafsky, cr. 1665, died in Persia.

28. Athan. Laurent. Ordin Nashchokin, doumni dvor. 1658, ok. 1665, boyar 1667; in 1672 he became a monk at Pskoff. In 1667, July 15, the *Posolsky* pr. (office for embassies and foreign affairs) was placed under him, with many additions, *e.g.* from the *Rozriad* the affairs of the principalities of *Smolensk* &c.; also of *Little Russia* &c., and the *Galitskaia* and *Vladimirskaia Cheti* &c., and the *Oustiojskaia*. (After he had become a monk his place was filled by Artemon. Serg. Matveëff, who from a head (golova) and stolnik or polkovnik (colonel) of streltsi had been made a doumni dvorianin in 1671, and okolnik in 1672, till he was exiled in July 1676.) See p. 272, and p. 117.

29. Iv. Bogdan. Miloslafsky, cr. 1665.

Doumnie dvorianini living 1st Dec. 1666.

1. Bas. Theod. Yanoff, cr. 1653, also yaselnik.

2. Athan. Osip Pronchischeff, cr. 1654, d. 1671. In 1663, together with the ok. Ivan Theod. (senior) Streshneff, he sat in the *Monastirski* pr. till 1666.

3. *Iv. Paul. Matiushkin* (whose wife was a Streshneff, aunt to the tsar through his mother Eudocia Lucianovna; so Matiushkin

was brother-in-law to the boyar Sim. Lucian. Streshneff), cr. 1654: he was under Boris Iv. Morozoff in the prikaz *Bolshoi Kazni* in 1646; and they had under them the diak Nazar Cheestoy, who was killed by the enraged people in 1648 (in 1657 Anikey Cheestoy was diak in the same prikaz under Elia Dan. Miloslafsky).

4. Andr. Bas. Boutourlin, cr. 1655.

5. Jdan Bas. Kondireff, yaselnik in 1651 (Matiushkin the son succeeded him), d. 1667.

6. Procop. Kouzm. Eleazaroff, cr. 1655: presided over the *Kostromskaia Chetc.* 1657-1671, and in the *Zemski Dvor* 1657-1677.

7. *Iv. Iv. Baklanofsky*, cr. 1655; with Elia Dan. Miloslafsky in the *Bolshoi Kazni* pr. in 1665; in the *Poushkarski* pr. with pr. Youry Alex. Dolgorouky 1657-1662. See *Replies of Nicon*, p. 587, 600.

8. Greg. Mich. Anitchkoff, cr. 1659, d. 1671; had the *Novaia Chet.* 1666-1671.

9. Iv. Athanas. Pronchischeff, cr. 1662: he was with Elia Dan. Miloslafsky in the pr. *Bolshoi Kazni* in 1663; had the *Bolshoi Prichod* 1668-1671.

10. Zamiatna Theod. Leontieff, cr. 1662, d. 1670.

11. Iv. Iv. Chaadaeff, cr. 1662; in the *Reitarski* pr. in 1678 with the boyar Iv. Mich. Miloslafsky.

12. Greg. Bor. Ordin Nashchokin, cr. 1664, d. 1676; was over the *Kholopi Soud* (to judge of matters concerning personal bondsmen and serfs) 1661-1663 (then the stolnik Iv. Iv. Streshneff till 1677), over the *Chelobitni* pr. 1666-1668, and the *Yamski* pr. 1666-1668.

13. Sim. Iv. Zabourofsky, doumni diak 1655-1664, cr. doumni dvor. 1665. As doumni dvor. he sat in the *Monastirski* pr. from 16 Feb. 1668 to 1677, when its business was all transferred to the *Bolshoi Droretz;* he had the *Rozriadni* pr. 1663-1665.

14. Yak. Tim. Khitroff, cr. 1665, d. 1676.

15. Iv. Bogd. Khitroff, cr. 1666, ok. 1675, boyar 1676.

16. *Almiaz Ivanoff*, doumni diak from 1655. In 1654 the *Pechatni* pr. was placed under the Posolski pr. and so under its diak Almiaz Ivanoff. The Novgorodskaia Chet. was under the Posolski pr. and under Ivanoff as its separate diak 1660-1661. He was over the Posolski 1654-1658 and 1665-1667 (being now

a doumni dvorianin): he had the *Pechatni* pr. (of the seal) in 1666, and again in 1668: he was created *Pechatnik* (keeper of the seal) in 1667; he died 27 April 1669. See p. 77, 393, 395; and the *Replies of Nicon*, p. 586, &c.

Bogdan Iv. Nashchokin was made a doumni dvorianin in 1667; and

Hilarion Dmi. Lopouchin, who was of noble family, after being a doumni diak from 1655, was made a doumni dvorianin in 1667: he was chief diak in the *Pechatni* pr. from 1654: and over the *Posolski* pr. 1658 &c. and 1663-1665: he died in 1671.

Doumnie diaki (secretaries of the council) in Dec. 1666.

1. *Dementi Bashmakoff*, from 1664, after the resignation of Zabourofsky: he was over the *Rozriad* 1665-1677. See p. 81, 94, 395.

2. Gregory Karaouloff, from 1665: he was, with other diaks, over the *Pomiestni* pr. from 1666; and over the *Chelobitni* pr. 1671-1672.

3. Alexander Douroff, from 1666, d. 1671.

In 1667 Gerasim Dochtouroff and Lucian Golosoff were made doumnie diaki.

Other officers of the court in Dec. 1666.

1. *Kraichi* (grand-echanson), the prince Peter Sim. Ourousoff; he was made boyar in 1676. This office (which was usually filled by grandees or near connections of the sovereign, and which of itself gave a rank equal to that of an okolnik) had been held before from 1648 to 1659 by Peter Mich. Soltikoff.

2. *Kaznachey* (treasurer), Athanasius Sam. Narbekoff, from 1664. This officer too was equal in rank to an okolnik, but the kraichi took precedence of him: he presided over the *Kazenni* prikaz.

3. *Postelnik* (of the bed-chamber), Gregory Iv. Rtischeff, from 1656. From 1650 to 1656 he had been *Strapchi s' kliuchem*, under his relative Michael Alex. Rtischeff, who was postelnik during the same time. When he died, in 1656, his son Theodore Mich. succeeded him, but was postelnik only for a short time, being made an okolnik in the same year.

4. *Strapchi s' kliuchem* (grand master of the wardrobe), Theodore Al. Polteff, appointed on the promotion of Greg. Iv. Rtischeff in 1656. He had under him all the inferior servants of the palace, and was the subordinate colleague of the postelnik:

he ranked above all the stolniks, even those who were called *Komnatnie* (of the chamber), but he was below the doumnie dvorianini. Polteff also was promoted to be postelnik in 1669; and a son of his, as appears from the name Sim. Theod. Polteff, was made a doumni dvorianin in 1671.

5. *Yaselnichi* (over the manger), Ivan Athanas. Jelaboujsky from 1664 to 1668. This officer was under the *Koniushi* (master of the horse), when there was one; but if there was none he presided alone in the *Koniushi* prikaz.

6, 7. *Lovchi* and *Sokolnichi* (huntsman and falconer), Athanas. Iv. Matiushkin, from 1653, when he was a stolnik. When these two offices were held separately, the *sokolnichi* was the higher. From 1654 Athanasius Iv. Matiushkin was also yaselnichi, and presided in the *Koniushi Dvor* (office and court of the stables): he had also the care of the falconry, of which the tsar Alexis was passionately fond: and this Matiushkin, being also first cousin to the tsar, was personally a prime favourite.

XXVI.

With reference to p. 41, where Paisius mentions Bogdan Matv. Khitroff, and to p. 429. Compare too p. 52, 191, 384, 398; and the *Replies of Nicon*, p. xxxix. 16, 669.

Extracts &c. from a book entitled 'Present State of Russia,' the first edition of which was published in 1667, a second in 1668, and a third in 1670, by Dr. Samuel Collins, chaplain to the Company of the English merchants at Moscow, where he seems to have been from the beginning of 1660. In consequence of additions having been inserted into the later editions there is frequently an appearance of inconsistency in the dates, and the time spoken of as present by the writer varies from 1660 to 1669.

'The art of printing was introduced into Russia in A.D. 1560, and *a Latin school* erected; but *Levi* destroyed it *ei et armis* . . . They kneel not in their devotions, but lie prostrate [stand, or prostrate themselves]. At Whitsuntide they fall prostrate [really at those prayers on Whitsunday they do kneel] on sycomore branches (our maple) . . . They have no instrumental music, for the *last* patriarch [Nicon] *abrogated* it because the papists use it. . . . Three hours after sunrise they have the *obiedna* (the liturgy), about one A.M. the *zaoutrenni*, and at sunset the *vecherni*. . . . You shall have five or six persons reading confusedly to-

gether, one a *chapter*, another a psalm, a third a prayer, &c. . . . When a pope's wife dies he must officiate no longer. . . . He that takes up the Russian faith, be he Lutheran or Papist, must first renounce his former baptism, curse father and mother, and spit thrice over his shoulder &c. . . If a man thinks his wife to be barren, he will persuade her to turn nun, that he may marry another; if she refuses, he will cudgel her into a monastery. If the empress had not brought a second tsarevich, born June 2, 1661, after four girls together, it is thought she would have been sent to her devotions. . . . In Lent on [three days in the week] they eat no fish, but feed on cabbage and cucumbers and rye bread, and drink quass. They will not drink after a man that eats flesh. . . . Heresy among the Russians is punished with fire. . . . They waste abundance of paper in *rolls* of great length; and though they have a table before them, they cannot write but on their knees, as in the picture of St. Jerom. Their clerks they call podiaks [under-secretaries], and him that is *lord deputy*[51] diak. The boyar receives the petition [of any suitor in his prikaz] *if he is in a good humour*, and gives it to his diak, *who commonly must be bribed*. . . . The accused criminal cannot be condemned unless he confesses. . . . Crim Tatary is tributary to the Turk, and Moscow was formerly tributary to them, and paid 10,000 sheepskin coats yearly; and the grand duke was to feed the Crim's horse with oats out of his cap: to this he was sworn by strict oath. But within these ten years the tribute has been refused, because the Tatars broke the league by invading the confines. They will march 100 miles a day, changing their horses once or twice. . . . Till the Polish war the lues venerea was not known here.

His imperial majesty, intending to marry, had divers young ladies brought before him: at last he liked one (who, they say, is very beautiful still): but his chief confessor[52] had a mind to persuade him to marry another, who had a younger sister. Well; when this fair lady above mentioned was brought, they found his majesty's inclination so strong for her that they feared she

[51] In many of the prikazes there were only diaks; and a doumni diak or secretary of the council, as Almiaz Ivanoff when he was in the Posolsky prikaz, was a great man: hence the writer's blunder.

[52] Being in league, it is implied, with Morozoff and Miloslafsky: or the 'chief confessor' may mean Morozoff himself, the young tsar's governor, who meant to marry the younger sister.

would get the crown. And so indeed she did; it being a ceremony, on his showing his liking, to tie the crown upon her head. But the plot was so laid, that the women should tie up her hair so hard as to throw her into a swoon, which they did, crying out that she had the falling sickness. Upon this her father was accused of treason for proposing his daughter, whipped, and sent with disgrace into Siberia, where he died. The maid remains still unmarried, and has never had any fit since. The emperor, being conscious of the wrong he has done her, allows her a very great pension.

The emperor's father-in-law Elia Danilovich Miloslafsky dares not call the empress his daughter, nor dare any of her kinsfolk speak of themselves as being such: nor does Ivan Paulovich Matiushkin [assistant to Morozoff in the prikaz *Bolshoi Kazni*] dare to say that he is his uncle [he being husband to the maternal aunt of the tsar]. The *diak* of the Posolsky prikaz is nominally Boris Ivanovich [Morozoff], but really Elia Miloslafsky. . . . The tsar seldom marries from out of the nobility. Elia was of so mean account that within these *twenty* years he drew wine to some Englishmen, and his daughter gathered mushrooms and sold them in the market. The other lady, whom [but for the management used] the tsar should have married, was a captain's daughter (p. 57). . . . Elia rose through the medium of his uncle [the tsar's uncle Matiushkin?], who was secretary or chancellor in the Posolsky prikaz, and to whom he filled wine. . . . The present tsaritsa was a tolerable beauty, adorned with the precious jewels of modesty, industry, and religion. She was married privately, for fear of witchcraft (p. 149). . . . But the other sister made Boris Ivanovich jealous; and he sent William Barnsby to Siberia, who, after twenty[53] years, *turned Russ* and richly married. Boris died six years ago [so *this* passage seems to be written in A.D. 1668, the same year in which Elia Dan. Miloslafsky died], beloved by the prince, but *not by the nobility*, who *cannot yet accomplish their designs;* for Elia Danilovich is made generalissimo (p. 117). Elia is a goodly person, has limbs and muscles like Hercules, a bold man, of great parts, and such a vast memory, &c. The tsar *rather feared* than loved him; *but the tsaritsa always kept up his interest.* He is made lord trea-

[53] If of banishment, from A.D. 1648; and then it should rather be '*has* turned;' but it may be after twenty years from his first coming to Russia.

surer, and six or seven other offices besides are conferred on him, all of which he manages with great vigour, *but not without bribery*;[54] which the tsar did the more connive at because he knew all would return to the ocean. Perceiving [so the English chaplain continues, that Elia's immoralities[54] were too scandalous] the tsar urged him either to marry, or refrain from coming to court. At *present* [so he puts this in in 1667 or 1668], having had an apoplectic fit, Elia is disabled in body and mind, and knows nobody without being told. His *loss* had been the greater, had not that great statesman Nashchokin succeeded, and supplied his place in many offices.

It was this Nashchokin that concluded the peace with Poland on honourable terms (30th Jan. 1667), and finished the league with Sweden. He is now made chancellor of the Posolsky prikaz, treasurer, lord of Little Russia, and has several other offices. He contrived the silk trade through Russia; and it is thought that all the Indian trade will be drawn that way. He is now about reforming the Russian laws and new-modelling all the tsar's empire. There are to be no dilatory suits: all the governors with their assistants are to have power of life and death: for before all criminals were brought to Moscow. This Nashchokin is one who will not be corrupted: he is a very sober abstemious man, indefatigable in business, an admirer of monarchy: he is the only patron the English have here; a very great and wise minister of state, not inferior peradventure to any one in Europe' (p. 109). [Nashchokin's son Voin, seeing the leaning which his father, and indeed the tsar too, showed towards western civilisation, and having been brought into communication with Poles and other foreigners, became a Catholic, and availing himself of the opportunity afforded by an official mission, went away across the frontier. The father's letter to the tsar on this occasion is not unlike one which Lord Clarendon wrote to Charles II. on the discovery of the marriage of the duke of York to his daughter, a *treason* for which he *besought his majesty to take his head*. Alexis condoled with his afflicted minister, and assured him that it made no difference in his trust and favour, *offering* at the same time to

[54] Elsewhere we are told by another writer that Elia had *reasons of his own* for being an enemy to the patriarch Nicon; and that *through him* the *tsaritsa* also was unfriendly to Nicon.

take measures for getting the son into his power, *or for making away with him*, wherever he might be; but Nashchokin did not quite desire the execution of this *most gracious* suggestion. Nashchokin had *not* by origin (any more than Matveëff) belonged to the higher nobility, who were jealous of his merits and of the favour shown him by the tsar; and the tsar was glad, *so far as he dared*, to advance such men to high offices, to balance the power of others. When the boyar Niketa Ziuzin wrote to Nicon, as if in the tsar's name, to come to Moscow, in 1664, Nashchokin and Matveëff were the men through whom he represented himself as having received his directions: and his whole story was sufficiently well devised to deceive Nicon, who certainly knew well enough of what the tsar might be capable. But Nashchokin, when examined in consequence, not only disclaimed all personal acquaintance with Nicon, but made the most abject apology for having, contrary to a warning from the tsar, allowed Ziuzin to cross his threshold even to speak with him on a matter of business: and such he felt was the gravity of this offence that, though he had been that morning to confession, he could not, till he should have his majesty's forgiveness, go with a safe conscience to holy communion! What, then, must have been his feelings of remorse and despair at the treason, when his own son abandoned the service of the most orthodox tsar, and the ordinations and the chrism of Paisius Ligarides, to submit himself to the successor of St. Peter, as if in exchange and compensation for that other runaway Ligarides, who had preferred the service and communion and absolution of the tsar to that of the pope? However this may have been, the tsar was to lose the father also as well as the son: for Nashchokin himself, in 1672, retired from public life, and became a monk at Pskoff.]

Of the patriarch Nicon the English chaplain writes: 'The patriarch is supreme head over all church affairs, highly honoured by his majesty: but *upon some pet* he retired to his country house about two years ago [so he is writing in 1660]. Some say he began to *innovate* in certain things, or rather to reform them: for he is no lover of images,[55] to which the Russians are grossly devoted. The see continues *vacant*, and they *cannot choose another* in his place. His palace adjoins the emperor's, built of stone, and is stately enough for bigness. His place is

[55] Not of Polish or Latin images. See the *Travels of Macarius*, p. 150.

supplied by a metropolitan in the ceremony of Palm Sunday [*i.e.* by Pitirim in 1659 and 1660] after this manner: A great guard of soldiers lie prostrate with their faces on the ground;' and so on, describing the ceremony (p. 17).

His imperial majesty [an engraving from whose portrait, taken at the age of thirty-four, and so in 1663, is given as a frontispiece] is a goodly person, two months older than Charles II., of a sanguine complexion, light-brown hair, his beard uncut; he is tall and fat, of a majestic deportment, *severe in his anger*, bountiful, charitable, chastely uxorious, very kind to his sisters and children, of a strong memory, strict in his devotions, and a favourer of his religion; and *had he not such a cloud of sycophants and jealous nobility about him*, who blind his good intentions, no doubt he might be numbered amongst the best and wisest of princes.

His father was a great lover of Englishmen, and a man of peace [see *Travels of Macarius*, p. 138]: but this emperor is of a warlike spirit, engaged against the Crim Tatars, the Poles, and the Swedes, with what success let time declare. This much I know: this empire is impoverished, depopulated, and spoiled so much in ten years (1653-1663) that it will not recover its former prosperity in forty. Seven years ago [in A.D. 1654 and 1656] the plague carried off 700,000 or 800,000 people; and three years ago [alluding to the disasters of Konotop in June 1659, and in Lithuania in 1660] the Crim Tatars carried away captive out of the Ukraine 400,000 souls, besides 300,000 who fell by the sword in several armies. Every thing is six times as dear as it was formerly; and the copper money [suppressed from 15 June 1663] is not valued (p. 45).

The emperor is absolute, and has a council both general and particular to advise with. The imperial palace is built of stone and brick, except some lodgings wherein his majesty sleeps and eats all the winter: for they esteem wooden rooms far wholesomer than stone, which are arched, thick, and damp. He lodges three stories high. He lies in no sheets, but in shirt and drawers. He is heir to all who die intestate, criminally, or without heirs. He is temperate in his diet, and drinks very little wine. On fast-days he frequents midnight prayers, the old vigils of the Church, standing four, five, or six hours together, and prostrating himself to the ground sometimes a hundred times, and on great festivals

a thousand times. In the great fast he eats but three meals a week, viz. on Thursday [Wednesday], Saturday, and Sunday. For the rest he takes a piece of brown bread and salt, a pickled mushroom or cucumber, and drinks a cup of small beer. He eats fish but twice in the great Lent, and observes it for seven weeks together, besides the maslinitsa week, when they eat milk and eggs. Out of the fast he observes Monday, Wednesday, and Friday, and will not then eat any thing coming of flesh. . . . He gives three or four rounds of spirits out of his own hand at entertainments of his nobility, sitting in his chair, and *will laugh to see his subjects handsomely fuddled;* and *sometimes he will put mercury into their liquor.*'

Again elsewhere he writes: 'The tsar is a goodly person, about six feet high, well set, inclined to fat, of a clear complexion, lightish hair, of a somewhat low forehead, *of a stern countenance, severe in his chastisements,* but very careful of his subjects' love. . . . He never went to any subject's house but to his governor's,[56] when he was thought to be past recovery. His sentinels and guards stand silent like statues: no noise is heard in the palace, no more than if it were uninhabited. None but his domestics are suffered to approach the inner court, except the lords that are in office. . . . The emperor most commonly dispatches the affairs in the time of their church service, when he is attended by all his nobles, and if he miss any he inquires after them (comp. *Travels of Macarius*, p. 140, 315). He never dines publicly but on festivals, and then his nobles dine in his presence.

Every year, towards the end of May, he goes three miles out of Moscow to Obrazofsky, where he has tents, his own and his tsaritsa's, with those of his *eleven* children and five sisters [which] stand in a circle with the church.

When he goes into the country or into the fields, none may interrupt him with petitions. A captain of White Russia, not getting his three years' arrears of pay from Peter Soltikoff, lord of the province,[57] and coming too near the tsar's coach, the tsar, seeing no petition in his hand, suspected he might be an assassin,

[56] *i.e.* to the house of Boris Iv. Morozoff, probably in 1660; and after that visit it was no doubt that the tsar wrote to Nicon to Voskresensk asking his forgiveness for Morozoff, though he did not actually die till 1662.

[57] The Smolenski prikaz, and so the affairs of White Russia, were placed under the Posolski pr., and so under Nashchokin, 15 July 1667.

and with his staff (once the tsar Ivan's[58]), not unlike a dart, intending to push the fellow away, he struck him to the heart, and he died.[59] The nobles rode up to the coach, and searching what arms the man had, found nothing but a wooden spoon and a petition for three years' arrears: whereupon the tsar smote his breast, and said: 'I have killed an innocent man; but Peter Soltikoff is guilty of his blood, whom God forgive!' And immediately sending for him, after a severe rebuke he turned him out of his place, banished him the court, and appointed Nashchokin, that great minister of state, to take his office, and examine and search out the misdemeanors thereof. This happened in June last; and this action was but whispered, and that too with much peril of a man's tongue.

In the night-time the tsar will go about and visit the desks of his chancellors, and see what decrees are passed, and what petitions are unanswered. He has his spies in every corner. 'Tis death for any one to reveal what is spoken in the tsar's palace. The tsar's children are attended by children appointed to them to be bred up with them.

The Jews have strangely crept in of late to the city and court by means of one surgeon, who calls himself a Lutheran, *and assists Bogdan Matveyeff Khitroff* (the dvoretskoy, or grandmaster of the palace) *in his amours*, and supplies him with Polish handmaids. But his lady being jealous of these became a burden to him: so one morning *last winter*, after eating some dainties, she was found dead in her bed. This caused much grumbling among the commons: and since that time the tsar has urged him to marry and abandon that wicked life he led with his Polish doxies, or else he should quit his place. 'Twas said he would take one of his mistresses for his wife.[60]

[58] That is, the staff of John IV. the Terrible, the same with which he had committed various cruelties, and with which he had killed his own son. With its pointed end John IV. once transfixed the foot of a messenger who had brought him a letter from the prince Kourbsky, and pinned it to the ground.

[59] Compare the *Travels of Macarius*, p. 138, and the account given at p. 276 and p. 296 of the death of Basil Bas. Boutourlin in 1656.

[60] This is the man who made what Paisius Ligarides calls 'the beginning of skirmishing,' as before a battle, by striking the patriarch's officer, and when remonstrated with repeated the blow, whom Nicon anathematised, and the Eastern patriarchs honoured for what he had done and blessed in their council, when they wrenched the cross out of the hands of Nicon's clerk.

This Bogdan is *the tsar's great favourite*, lord high steward, who regulates all the domestic affairs. He *was bred up from a child with the tsar*, and is of the same age. They call him 'the whispering favourite,' because wherever he comes to the council he acts behind the door. *Nashchokin is no friend to him*, nor he to the English, getting more money from the Dutch.

The tsar is a great patron of the Church, yet restrains the profuse bounty of dying men to the clergy. None can found a monastery without his license.[61] He makes bold with the church treasury *on loan*, in time of war, and *repays ad Græcas kalendas*. For, indeed, else his contributions would fall short, seeing that the Church holds about *two-thirds* of the empire.[62] In his palace he has a hospital of very old men, men 120 years old, with whom he delights to converse and to hear what passed in his ancestors' time. He disposes of all ecclesiastical preferments; but he left the election of the patriarch to lot,[63] having as he thinks had ill-luck in using his prerogative [to overrule or influence the lots when they were really used] for the election of the last patriarch Nicon.

To conclude: without doubt this present emperor of Russia is as pious, conscientious, clement, merciful, and good a prince as any in the world. As for his people and ministers of state, they are like those of other nations, *ready to act anything for bribes or money*, and to deceive [as much and] as many as they can.'

Whatever else came to the knowledge or attracted the attention of the English protestant merchants and their congenial chaplain, they do not seem to have been aware that in 1666-1667 there was something like an 'œcumenical council' sitting at Moscow; else the chaplain, in speaking of the election of a new patriarch, could scarcely have failed to mention it.

[61] And when he gives his license, even to the patriarch, the boyars make him take it away again, and make the Eastern patriarchs excuse the giving of it as an act of weakness, and bless him for breaking his vows made to God, and encourage him to bring himself under his own imprecations.

[62] The boyars say that Nicon, if he had only had power and time, would have seized *one-third* part of the kingdom; but when Nicon is proposing terms for his own retirement, and observes that the patriarchal house can afford to contribute something to his maintenance, as he had raised its revenues by as much as 20,000 rubles yearly, they cannot make out that he has increased them by anything like so much.

[63] *i.e.* of the patriarch Jonsaph, consecrated 10th March 1667, though the statement is inaccurate: see above, pp. 261, 262, 267.

XXVII.

From the Synodal Archives. An order made by the patriarchs and the synod for removing Nicon from the Therapontoff to another distant monastery; not executed at the time when it was made, but returned to, and put forwards eight years later by, the patriarch Joachim, who, in A.D. 1676 (May 16), after the death of the tsar Alexis, removed Nicon to the Cyrilloff monastery, and treated him with great severity.

'A.M. 7176, April 9 (A.D. 1668). *The most holy patriarchs Paisius &c., Macarius &c.*, and Joasaph &c., and the most reverend metropolitans, archbishops, and bishops, and all the sacred synod who happened to be then present at Moscow, judged with reference to the monk Nicon, *on account of certain considerations*, that it shall be as follows:

The monk Nicon shall be removed from the Therapontoff monastery, in which it was ordered by the most holy patriarchs and by all the sacred synod that he should live, and *be transported to another distant monastery.*

Joseph, sometime archimandrite of the Novospass, and the other people on service with him, who have been sent to the monk Nicon [to guard him], shall be changed, and in his stead there shall be sent to succeed him some other ecclesiastic of rank, whom the great hossoudar shall name.

That archimandrite or hegoumen who shall be sent shall be most strictly commanded, under pain of ecclesiastical punishment, to admit *no persons whatever* into that monastery in which it shall be ordered that the monk Nicon is to live *with any letters or commissions to him of any kind whatever*; and to take care that *no letters whatever, by any bearer whatever, reach him*; likewise that *no letters whatever, by any bearer whatever, be taken from him, the said Nicon, to any one else whatever.*

Farther, the most holy patriarchs have made order that the archimandrite or hegoumen who shall be appointed to be with Nicon till farther order shall have his meat and drink provided from the Cyrilloff, and from the other monasteries of the diocese of Vologda and Bielo-ozero.'

XXVIII.

i. From the Synodal Archives. A minute, '*How they escorted forth the patriarch Macarius of Antioch with the crosses*,' &c., at his departure from Moscow.

'Having gone to the cathedral the patriarchs robed, and began the *moleben* (the παράκλησις), "*Vodou proshed, i mnoghimi soderjim*" &c., and went out from the cathedral with the crosses; and at the same time they sounded the great bell. And when they were come to the Calvary outside the Kremlin (the Lobnoe miesto), they read the gospel; and there was a benediction with the cross. And they went from the Lobnoe miesto to the Moskva, to the barge; and there they finished the moleben. And after the dismissal there was again a benediction with the cross towards all the four quarters. And after the benediction, Paul the metropolitan of Kroutitz, having taken a blessing from the most holy patriarch, spoke an address to the most holy patriarch of Antioch; and after the address the patriarch of Antioch said, "Peace be to all," and blessed with his hands to all the four quarters. And the most holy patriarch Joasaph bade them go back with the crosses to the cathedral. And the crosses were accompanied by the metropolitan Paul with the heads of the clergy.'

ii. 'In the year of the world 7176, July—(A.D. 1668), by ukaz of the great hospodin the most holy Joasaph &c., a minute of instructions was given to the patriarchal sin-boyar Roman Ivan. Vladikin to go from Moscow to Nijny-Novgorod, and to Kazan, and so far as it may happen to be necessary, till he comes up with the most holy Kyr Macarius patriarch of Antioch &c. And when he comes up, he (Roman) shall deliver to the patriarch Macarius a letter from the most holy Joasaph patriarch of Moscow &c., and return to Moscow with such letter as the patriarch Macarius may give him (Roman) for the patriarch Joasaph in reply &c. To this podorojnoy the seal of the most holy patriarch Joasaph is affixed.

As soon as he is with the most holy patriarch Macarius, he is to make a speech to him, in the name of the most holy patriarch Joasaph, as is set down in writing; and after pronouncing the speech he is to make an obeisance.

Speech to be spoken to the most holy Macarius patriarch of Antioch;

"Most holy and most blessed Kyr Macarius, by the mercy of God patriarch &c., the brother in the Holy Ghost of thy holiness Kyr Joasaph &c. has bidden me to make an obeisance to thy holiness, and he is anxious to learn that thy health has been good during this thy journey!" Then, after making an obeisance, he is to continue repeating the same preamble as above over again, and ending with these words: "has sent to thy holiness a letter."

Copy word for word from the paper which Roman Vladikin brought back, Oct. — of this present year 7177 (A.D. 1668).

"Macarius, by the mercy of God patriarch &c., to the most holy and most blessed Joasaph &c.: May you be in health, great high-priest, for many years on your prelatical chair. As for your goodness in inquiring about us, we by the help &c. of God &c., and of the B. Virgin &c., and of all the saints, and by the prayers of the primates and apostolic vicars of the great city of God, Antioch, and also together (with theirs) by your prelatical prayers, as we travel by land from Astrachan to the sea, are alive in the body this day Sept. 8. I do reverence [and thank] you, great prelate and high-priest of God, for your goodness, that thou hast been pleased to send me word from thy prelacy of thy prelatical virtuous continuance, and respecting thy throne of the primacy of the Russian empire committed to thee of God; and I rejoice to learn that thy prelacy is in good health. I could wish to see thy prelatical countenance for the fulness of joy in Christ; but this is not possible, owing to the great distance and length of the way. But when thou, great prelate, standest at the tremendous altar of the Lord of glory, and offerest the unbloody sacrifice to God and the Father, with the metropolitans, archbishops, and bishops, and with all the sacred synod, then, great prelate, remember us also in thy holy prayers acceptable to God. And may thy prelacy in like manner be remembered by the Lord God in his heavenly kingdom in Christ Jesus our Lord, now and ever, and world without end. Amen."

"Written on the road, Sept. 9, A.M. 7177."

XXIX.

From 'Monumens Historiques relatifs au règne d'Alexis Michaelovich,' &c. published at Rome at the Vatican Press by P. Aug. Theiner of the Oratory. 1 vol. fol. 1859, p. 52, cap. xxii.

i. *The nuncio informs the Pope of a conversation between the tsar, the Polish ambassadors, and the Eastern patriarchs respecting the succession to the crown of Poland and the reunion of the Russian Church to the Catholic* (*Nunziatura di Polonia*, vol. 81).

(Warsaw, 8th Jan. 1668).... 'The Polish ambassadors report that they were recently invited by the grand duke to a private entertainment, and that while they were drinking jovially, as is the custom with these nations, a certain Nashchokin, who has been more than once ambassador in Poland, one of those who are most respected in that court both for his birth and for his understanding, began seriously, and in the language of a man well informed, to set forth what a great happiness it would be to both alike of these nations, if they could agree to a perpetual peace, and since the king of Poland had expressed his intention of remaining a widower, arrange by a free election that the eldest son of the grand duke of Muscovy should succeed to that kingdom, and so both these great realms should be under the government of one and the same prince; a union which would insure the total depression of the common enemy [the Turks], and of all the other barbarians at the same time. *The grand duke himself took it up*, and said to the ambassadors, that, *considering that there could be nothing else to disincline them to this proposal but the point of religion, perhaps they would be pleased to have a little conversation on the subject with the patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch* now present here at Moscow, who had been called thither by him *to judge and depose*, as they had already done, the patriarch of Muscovy.

The ambassadors went, and were by them also strenuously exhorted to exert themselves *for this good end* [*i.e.* the election of the tsarevich]; for the happy accomplishment and security of which the same patriarchs said it was above all necessary to settle between them the point of religion; and that as at other times the Eastern Church had been united with the Western, it was not a great matter to return to the same unity at this present day also.

However, the same ambassadors also report, that the said patriarchs had, after the assembling of a council, deposed, as has been said, the patriarch of Muscovy, solely because it had been signified to them by the grand duke that he had shown that he did not think ill of the Latin Church.

ii. Then in ch. xxiii.: *The king of Poland writes to the patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch, to the metropolitan of Gaza, and to the tsar, to coöperate for the reunion of the Eastern Church with the Catholic* (*Nunziat. di Pol.* vol. 81).

(*Warsaw*, 28 *March* 1668). '*To the most reverend fathers in Christ the lords Paisius of Alexandria and Macarius of Antioch, patriarchs of the Eastern Church, gratefully and devoutly beloved by us, John Casimir, by the grace of God king of Poland, grand duke of Lithuania, Russia, Prussia, Mazovia, Samogitia, Livonia, Smolensk, Chernigoff; also hereditary king of the Swedes, the Goths, and the Vandals.*

Most reverend fathers in Christ: Our ambassadors have reported to us on their return from the court of the most serene grand duke of Muscovy, our brother, neighbour, and ally, that your religious persons are now sojourning in the capital city of Moscow; also that *you* rejoice at the peace which we have made, and have proposed that we should go on to try to bring about an ecclesiastical peace also. Nothing, certainly, is more desirable. Our faith flowed from the same one sole source, Jesus Christ: one faith, one church, under one head the vicar of Christ, long continued, and only flourished the more under the assaults of tyrants and heretics. Those holy Greek fathers with whose doctrine the Church is illumined, preserved unity and concord. They were other causes than piety and zeal for the glory of God which caused the dissension, and rent this seamless robe of Christ. Yet neither is there so great a difference between the Western and Eastern clergy respecting ecclesiastical controversies, but that, with a sincere will and intention, and with the diligent study of learned and pious men, it may be reconciled. . . . Certain difficulties, if they be rightly explained, may be removed and set at rest by the help of God without any great effort. To so desirable an end we are ready to devote not our royal authority and influence and all our energy only, but even our life. Nor do we doubt that the most serene tsar of Muscovy will be equally zealous for it with ourselves. Therefore we write to him, and wish and suggest that a certain time and place should be fixed where conference for making union may be held between delegates of the archbishop of Gnesnen and the other bishops of Poland and your most reverend devotions, and the lord patriarch and metropolitans and bishops of Muscovy or their delegates.

We hope also that the most holy Pope of Rome, Clement IX., of his piety and zeal will favour this negotiation, and paternally approve and take part in it by his letters or by his delegate, as we are writing to request of his holiness. We think a suitable time would be the month of June, and the best place Moscow, if this pleases the tsar and your devotions: of which expecting an answer as speedily as possible, we pray for your health and prosperity. Given in our palace at Warsaw, 28th of March 1668.'

iii. '*To the rev. father in Christ Paisius Ligarides metropolitan of Gaza of the Eastern Church, sincerely and devoutly beloved by us, John Casimir, king &c.* (*Warsaw, 28 March* 1668).

Most reverend father in Christ, ... Divine Providence having subjected to us people of different tongues and rites, we have desired and striven to unite them all in religious as well as civil concord: and we think it a peculiar mercy of God that we now have in your devotion, in the neighbouring grand duchy of Muscovy, a singularly available instrument towards this pious wish. And though your devotion, owing to your own special propension towards the concord of the Church, and also the singular zeal for the same which you have derived from your long habitual experience and knowledge of the Roman Church, needs no exhortation, still, that we may lend our hand as a king to so great a work as that of the union of the East and the West, we most earnestly engage your devotion to exert your utmost diligence towards making peace between the Latin and the Greek Churches, and to persuade [all whom you can influence] that nothing will contribute more to the lasting security of christian princes, to the glory of the Greek name, and to the welfare of nations. Let your devotion give proof that you deserve *the public reputation which you have for merit*, and give perpetuity to the present legation [fix you at Moscow?], while ecclesiastical matters, which have hitherto gone to ruin through discord, will be restored to prosperity by concord and peace. We have full confidence that the most serene grand duke of Muscovy will show equal zeal, as becomes a christian prince, with ourselves, and will promote so desirable a work; as we are writing more at length both to him and to the most rev. patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch, now at Moscow, to engage them to do. For the rest, we promise your devotion our royal favour; and we pray God for your good

health. Given at Warsaw in our palace, 28 March, A.D. 1668, in the 20th year of our reign over Poland and Sweden.'

Copy of letter to the Tsar.

iv. (Warsaw, 28 March 1668) . . . . . 'After the return of our ambassadors from Moscow, we found in their report to us that the most reverend lords the patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch, being at the same time the guests of your tsarish majesty, together with congratulations on the peace concluded between us great christian sovereigns and our realms, expressed the strongest wish that we should interpose our study and royal authority in order that the peace for so many ages longed for between the Eastern and the Western Church might again flourish, and the discord and dissensions now existing between them be appeased. And, since nothing can be more desirable for us than this, that the Catholic faith, which flourished of old in the Church by the concord of the Latin and the Greek fathers, should by the restoration of unity be increased—and this would be the most joyful event for all Christendom, and the extirpation of heresies—we readily offer our royal zeal, according to the desire and wish of the same most reverend patriarchs, towards this work of pacification, not doubting that your tsarish majesty also will concur with equal zeal and favour towards the same pious work. And since this cannot be effected without some conference of spiritual persons, both of the Latin and of the Greek rite, we should wish that this fraternal colloquy should be held either in some place nearer to us or in the capital itself of your tsarish majesty without any delay; in the month of June, if it so please your tsarish majesty. Wherefore we have charged the supreme primate of the kingdom of Poland, the most reverend archbishop of Gnesnen, to consult with the other bishops of the kingdom, and with those of the grand duchy of Lithuania, so that they may all collectively employ the same persons [as their representatives], who may be empowered to treat provisionally with the above-mentioned most reverend patriarchs, and the metropolitans and bishops, and all the clergy of the dominions of your tsarish majesty, or with their delegates. And this project we will submit to the first and supreme Vicar of Christ in his Church, Clement IX., now happily governing the same, and will beg him to receive with paternal affection this inclination of the most reverend patriarchs, and of all the

Greek rite aspiring towards holy union, so as to smooth down certain intervening difficulties, and to authorise the above-mentioned mutual conference by his pastoral blessing. Nor can we doubt that the Divine Majesty will also give his heavenly blessing to this pious work, &c. . . . . And all these [happy results] for ourselves and for you we sincerely hope that your tsarish majesty, our brother, may obtain, and live in health to see. Given at Warsaw, &c. [as above].

v. *In* ch. xxix. p. 60: *The reverend father Schieretzky, Dominican, at the suggestion of the nuncio to Poland, engages the metropolitan of Gaza at Moscow to confirm the two Eastern patriarchs, as well as the tsar himself, in their favourable dispositions on the subject of the reunion of the Eastern Church to that of Rome. Also a letter relating to the same from the nuncio to Card. Rospigliosi.*

'*To the Signor Cardinal Rospigliosi.* (*Warsaw*, 4 *July* 1668.)

'Most em. and rev. lord, my most honoured lord and patron: Although there has not up to this time been any answer made by the grand duke of Muscovy and the schismatical patriarchs who are in that capital to the letters written to them by his majesty for the union of the Churches, as I mentioned to your eminence in a former despatch, and consequently there remains little ground for hope that anything will be done, still, that we may not neglect to do anything we can, which may possibly conduce, especially at the present conjuncture, towards a work so much to the advantage of the Catholic religion, also in compliance with the direction given by your eminence to Mgr. Pignatelli by your letter of the 7th of April last, I am doing something to encourage the metropolitan of Gaza, who is there, *and ever more and more reputed of by them all*, to prosecute so holy a work. And to this end I have caused a letter to be written to him by the P. Lodov. Schieretsky, a Dominican, *who was many years in Muscovy, and who is a friend of the said metropolitan* (I enclose herewith a copy of the same letter), which will be secretly delivered into his own hands by a trader who starts hence to-morrow, and who will probably bring the answer, being to return within two months. All this I notify respectfully to your eminence, and making my obeisance, remain the most devoted and obliged servant of your eminence, G. archbishop of Corinth.' (From Warsaw, 4 July 1668.)

Copy of the letter of P. Lodov. Schieretsky to the Metr. of Gaza.

vi. (*Warsaw*, 20 *June* 1668). 'Most illustrious and most rev. lord, my most worshipful master: On the arrival here of my lord the new apostolic nuncio, I went, as was proper, to pay my respects to him, and I told him with what zeal for the true religion your most rev. lordship has laboured in these parts, and is still labouring to this present day, for the holy union of the Greek with the Catholic Roman Church, and of the excellent dispositions which not only both the patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch, but also the grand duke of Muscovy himself show.

'When the most illustrious the lord nuncio had heard all this with the greatest attention and interest, he immediately answered by extolling his (the grand duke's) great zeal, insinuating also that the Holy See is exactly informed of all the things that your most rev. lordship has been doing hitherto, and that it nods propitiously (annuere, or nods assent and approval) to the excellent intention of the same your most rev. lordship. Meanwhile it makes you a return in kind for *those lively affections* which not only will *crown your name with eternal glory*, but also will *be motives for notice with peculiar benignity from his beatitude.*

'These particulars I think it well to write to your most rev. lordship for your greater comfort, and at the same time to excite you the more to prosecute with all possible zeal this great work. But if your most rev. lordship knew that there was a hope of this most excellent project taking effect, I think it would be best that you should write to the most illustrious the lord nuncio himself (but so secretly and safely that there may be considered to be no room for any danger), and inform him exactly of the present state of the affair, and suggest what may be done farther, and of the means which may conduce towards the attainment of this end. For I perceive that it will be very agreeable to the nuncio; and he will answer you with all attention and dispatch. Your letters, for the greater security, your most rev. lordship will do well to send to me, with my name on the outside, and I will undertake to deliver them, and apply for the answer, that so I may have the pleasure of thinking that I have myself also been coöperating in some small way in this most momentous undertaking, and that too to the honour and glory of your most rev. lordship, whose hands I kiss with due reverence.' Warsaw, 20 June 1668.

vii. *At* p. 61, ch. xxxi. *The metropolitan of Gaza informs the P. Schieretsky of the persecutions of which he is the object at Moscow, on account of his zeal for the reunion of the two Churches* (*Nunziat. di Polon.* vol. 81).

Copy of letter dated Moscow, 25 Sept. 1668.

'Rev. sir, and most beloved in Christ, Ave! Your fatherhood inquires of me what I think about the matter of ecclesiastical reconciliation and peace, and what result I expect it to have. I will state my mind briefly: I think that it is at present a thing too arduous to attempt, and excessively difficult, not to say nearly impossible and untreatable, partly on account of sharp wars suddenly breaking out and continually more and more spreading, partly on account of terrible fires and conflagrations, which have suddenly come upon this great city. To these difficulties I have to add, that one of those two patriarchs, who played the first part here, has left to return [to his own country], and the other also is preparing for his journey. Of the rest nobody attends to these subjects, but all are occupied with other lesser matters and divers distractions. So time has grown long hair and gone away with it, and the opportunity only has existed uselessly and remained bald; *so that we* are straitened on all sides, and our heart is weighed down by the heaviest anxieties.

'I myself, *the only person who could have promoted this work, and who was inflamed with the most ardent zeal to see it succeed,* remain afflicted with intense mental pain, *and am so inwardly racked that I would rather die than continue in such a wretched state,* overwhelmed by misfortunes, *pursued by treacherous plots,* surrounded by *calumnies.* But that I may not seem to be uttering enigmas like the sibyls, or riddles like the prophetic sphinx, I will tell you the matter briefly. *The patriarch of Jerusalem Nectarius*[64] *had spread an ill report of me, that I am a worshipper of the Pope, altogether a Papist* (Pontificius), *as having sold myself to him, and being honoured with an annual pension of* 200 *gold scudi or ducats, as a beneficed clerk of the Roman Church, which if I were really enjoying, I should not feel aggrieved; but I have not a penny of all this, and I have the title without the victual* (titulumque habeo sine vitulo). Let the most holy congregation De Propaganda Fide consider attentively this point, *and decree whatever the Holy Ghost shall inspire,* through the favour and grace of

[64] See above, p. 359, 360, 363; and below, p. 552.

the new apostolic nuncio, *whom I beg to interpose his influence with weight in this matter*, insinuating moreover that *the patriarch* [of Moscow Joasaph] *is doing his utmost to get me excluded from all place in those most sacred synods of the clergy* (ut ex sacratissimis illis hierolocis exulem efficiat), thrusting me down by fair means and by foul (per fas et nefas); and to cut off *the whole thread of my hope*, which was simply *the prospect of my being hereafter raised to the patriarchate*. Behold in what straits I am! Behold the machinations which I have to make head against, without any one to help. I pray thy fatherhood to leave no stone unturned to do something for me with those whom you know to be able, and whom you are able to influence (omnem lapidem move apud quos scis et potes), *since friends are known in one's needs*. Be for me a *Mercurius* Trismegistus, defending me in adversity, and helping me with thy natural benevolence and thy prompt eloquence. Resting, then, on these advantages of thy talents, and acting boldly on them, *do what thou doest quickly*, not delaying in a matter so special (or excellent, eximio), and most worthy of thy zeal. Be pleased reverently to kiss in my name the most sacred hands of the most illustrious and most rev. apostolic nuncio, to whom I have not time at this present to write separately. * I will write more fully *if the god Fortuna adjuvans help*. If you can find a copy of *Horapollo*, with the diagrams and notes, I beg you to be so good as to send it me as quickly as possible; for I have great need of it. My services, for whatever I may be capable of, I offer and devote to the apostolic nuncio and pontifical legate. Farewell. Written at Moscow, 1668, Sept. 25. The dutiful beadsman of thy most rev. paternity Paisius Ligarides, metropolitan of Gaza, *m.p.*

'I send my best salutations to the most illustrious and most rev. lord abp. Nicholas, primate of the famous kingdom of Poland.'

viii. Ch. xxxiii. *Interesting communications made by the archbishop of Gnesnen to the apostolic nuncio to Poland, respecting the disposition of the grand duke and of the city of Moscow* (*Nunziratura di Polonia*, vol. 82).

(Warsaw, 16 Jan. 1669.) 'The gentleman sent by Mgr. the archbishop of Gnesnen to Moscow, with letters to the tsar communicating the king of Poland's abdication, has returned to this city. He reports as follows:

'After speaking of the very marked favour shown to him there . . . . [he says] that the tsar complained that the Poles had not kept the promise made to him in the capitulation of the truce, that they would join the forces of the kingdom with his against the Kozaks. . . . And it was reported that, in consequence of this, Kieff would not be restored to the Poles so soon as had been promised by Nashchokin. He says:

'That in that capital of Moscow there had been another great fire, caused by some accident, which had reduced to ashes many thousands of houses; and that the inhabitants having observed that there had been frequent fires in the same city since the grand duke had deposed and exiled their patriarch, they hence concluded that those fires were a consequence of the maledictions fulminated by the said patriarch: and on that account they murmured against the grand duke, who, fearing some outbreak, had sent to call him back; and, as he refused to come back, had sent people and carriages to bring him back perforce.

'Also, that some persons having come to Moscow from Lithuania, sent by certain persons of the Lithuanians with letters to the grand duke, not giving him his *full titles*, the tsar, by way of giving an example to others, had ordered them to give 300 lashes to the bearer of that letter which was the most defective.

'Also, that news had been received there of a most cruel defeat inflicted on the Muscovites by the Tatars, with the loss to the former of 15,000 men killed, and as many more taken prisoners, among whom were above 300 of their best officers: that on the receipt of this news there was a public mourning in the city during three successive days, such as they are used to make on occasion of the greatest disasters; and its effect on the grand duke was such that he was unwell and prostrated for eight days afterwards. It is known that the loss of the Muscovites is much greater than what was reported here a fortnight ago.

'Besides the above, there is information from Vilna that Nashchokin, the first minister of the grand duke of Muscovy, who is now in Courland, has written a letter to the palatine of Vilna, in which he assures him that the grand duke his master has [now] no desire to obtain the crown of Poland, neither for himself, nor for any one of his sons.'

XXX.

Letters of the patriarch of Jerusalem Dositheus to the tsar Alexis Mich. [*dated* 1 *Nov.* A.D. 1669, *but sent or received in*] 1670.

i. *Translation from a Greek letter which was written to the great hossoudar the tsar and grand prince Alexis Michaelovich &c., by the patriarch of Jerusalem, and sent by the Greek Herodion, son of Thomas, in this present year* 7178 (1670) *Feb.* 1.

Most religious, most serene, christian, god-crowned and god-established, and invincible, holy and great hossoudar, tsar and grand prince Alexis Michaelovich &c., our beloved son in the Holy Ghost, the helper of our mediocrity, and patron of the holy sepulchre of the Lord, and the hope and refuge of all orthodox Christians: Peace, prayer, and blessing be to thy powerful and holy empire from our mediocrity, and from our Lord and God and Saviour Jesus Christ health and salvation spiritual and bodily; to whom we also pray heartily for thy powerful and most illustrious empire to give you victory, and to strengthen you against your adversaries, and to put down all enemies, visible and invisible, under your feet.

It was not till after we had dispatched our archimandrite Prochorus to your capital city of Moscow, O great and holy hossoudar (*αὐζέντης*), that we heard of *the decease of the tsaritsa* Maria Ilichna, of blessed memory. We were exceedingly afflicted at that; and mourned with our most blessed father the ex-patriarch Nectarius, in the holy city of Jerusalem; and we gave orders to make commemoration for her, as is proper, according to custom: for she, the blessed empress, sent much alms to the holy sepulchre, and sacred vessels by the most blessed Kyr Paisius patr. of Jerusalem. And all those vessels remain in the treasury of the holy sepulchre to this day and for ever. And of her we will not write much to thy holy empire, because to thy understanding and wisdom there is enough of consolation. Remember the words of the righteous Job, who says, 'God gave, and God hath taken away; as it hath pleased the Lord, so it is.'

Farther, we have heard how the Lord God *has taken thy imperial children*;[65] and we pray God to preserve them that are

[65] The patriarch Macarius of Antioch was dismissed by the tsar May 31st' 1668: on the 28th Feb. 1669 the tsaritsa was delivered of a daughter, which died

still living in health unharmed for ever, to be inheritors of thy holy empire for many years and for ever.

In the month of July, as I was leaving Constantinople, and going to Philippopolis in quest of alms, there came to me thy majesty's servant Herodion, and delivered to me thy divine letter, which was written to thy beadsman the most blessed Nectarius, now ex-patriarch; and we, having received it as a divine gift, rejoiced greatly; and we read and understood its contents.

It was written about the metropolitan of Gaza, *that we should absolve him.* But he, Ligarides, O great hossoudar, *has upon him many and great crimes and sins,* the details of which I would have written and sent to thee, O great hossoudar, in proof [of what I say], only *shame would not suffer me to do so,*[66] *that shame* (or modesty) *with which we have been brought up.* One thing only we will say, viz. that Kyr Nectarius the patriarch *is not a man to write or say anything false,* but he is *such* a man for justice *that now another bishop like him,* for understanding and for the fear of God, *could scarcely be found.*

And now your powerful empire writes to us and requests us, as if it were proper '*that we should absolve him.*' But he writes to certain heretics, such as he is himself (whom we here have not, neither among the living nor among the dead), that 'though it be true that we are under the dominion of the Turkish sultan, still it is *by the lordship of the Turkish sultan* that we continue without any fear or alarm:' and [you desire] 'that from henceforth we should have him for one of our community, and for a fellow-minister and a brother beloved, since the spiritual art and doctrine resembles that of medicine, and at one time it punishes for correction, but at another absolves for repentance:' which [absolution for repentance, or repentance in order to absolution] *he,* Ligarides, *had no mind to.* But '*he has brought thy holy empire to a good end,* as being extremely intelligent, and very learned.' Therefore, also, we expressed regret [on account of him] to our most blessed father Nectarius, [and proposed] that he should par-

the same day; on the 3d March the tsaritsa Maria Ilichna died. On the 5th June the patriarch of Alexandria Paisius left Moscow; on the 19th of the same June the second surviving son of the tsar, Simeon, died; and on the 17th of January following, in A.D. 1670, his eldest son and heir-apparent Alexis Alex., for whom he had coveted the succession of Poland and Lithuania, died also.

[66] See above, p. 94, 96, 99-101, 370, 547, 79, 10.

don him, and let him be in the see of Gaza, and that they should name him there as their metropolitan in the holy service of the Church. But he writes to us that we 'should rather entreat thy empire to give him his dismissal from Moscow.' And we are aware how our father Nectarius wrote to your serenity to detain him, as if he were afraid that he should go off to the Roman Pope.

And as for that matter, let it be according to thy will, as thou, O great hossoudar, pleasest. If he is *wanted* by thy empire, *we are glad that he should be useful* to thy imperial majesty; but if thou wishest to send him away to us, we in that case will receive him; and as far as we have it in our power, we will supply him with the means of living *in retirement*, if he wishes it at Gaza, or, if he pleases, at Jerusalem, or in his native town in Chios, where the most blessed patriarch Nectarius established a metóchi as a school, when he was going to Jerusalem, and they now teach letters there for the good of his soul.

I, thy beadsman, am at present abiding here in Philippopolis, and in other towns near the Danube, till Easter, and then we think of going to the hospodars (*αὐθέντας*) of Moldavia and Wallachia to get help (*i.e.* alms). But for those friends of Ligarides to whom he writes, and seeks to frighten us, we care nothing for them whatever. But as touching what he writes to his friends, may it please thy majesty to take one of his letters [which seems to have been enclosed], and to read it through, that you may understand how he reviles and attacks his patriarch. And for that alone he ought to be degraded from the episcopal dignity. And thy majesty, who art both righteous and powerful, *might* have *commanded* us under the pressure of thy power to pardon him; but thou, as a religious tsar, writest to us and makest *request* only for his pardon. And *he* should have written to us in such terms as are fit for petition and entreaty; but he writes and abuses us, and calls us 'spiritually dead, and irreligious;' and our father the patriarch Nectarius he calls 'depravity,' 'a sort of wild beast,' 'a man who has lost his wits,' and 'a madman,' with many other unbecoming words, *for which I could have wished yet once more to give him the punishment he deserves*, for the honour of my father and elder Nectarius.

But since thy powerful and holy empire has written to us, thy beadsman, and hath made request for him, *we, out of respect to thy imperial majesty's request*, and out of affection for thee

take those unseemly, foul-mouthed, and insubordinate, and arrogant *revilings* of that metropolitan of Gaza *as if they were silvery light, and harmony, and a bouquet of sweet-smelling flowers:* and *by way of honour and praise* [*for them*] *we hold him absolved and blessed,* and freed from the *just* and tremendous excommunications and curses[67] of the patriarch Nectarius; and we make him not to have been affected by his guilt [ever so little].

Now the ruler of Wallachia the voivode Ducas is our good friend, and a helper of the holy sepulchre; and he is now founding a monastery for the help of the holy sepulchre; and *we are expecting* the return of our archimandrite Prochorus with the unspeakable *alms of thy imperial majesty,* who art our whole trust and hope and consolation. And thus much we will say: If thou, great hossoudar, dost not take in hand to help us, we have perished from the face of the earth;[68] and at Jerusalem it will not be possible for us to get out of our many debts; and we have nowhere else any refuge or protection, except thy orthodox and most illustrious empire. And for the greatness of its debt the infidel creditors are intending to pawn the holy sepulchre into the hands of the heretics; and we fear lest it should pass out of our hands. On this account we fall down on our face to the ground, and beg and implore the mercy and compassion of thy powerful empire, to send in aid of the holy sepulchre of the Lord thy imperial majesty's unspeakable alms, for thine own continuance in health for many years, and for the like continuance in health for many years of the noble and holy children of thy imperial majesty, and for that of thy holy sisters and daughters, and for the blessed memory of thy ever-to-be-remembered parents, and for that of the tsaritsa Maria Ilichna, and for that of the tsarevich Simeon Alexievich. *Let thy mercy,* most serene lord, *be upon us, as we do put our trust in thee.* And when we shall have received thy alms, I hope to go to the holy city of Jerusalem to pray to God for the preservation of thy empire in health for many years to the end of my life. And if we are relieved a little from the burden of our debts, by the help of God

[67] But the Slav. has *kleveti,* 'calumny,' instead of *klatvi,* 'curse,' which the sense requires.

[68] As at Florence they said, 'We are not convinced; but for aid against the Turks we must make a compromise;' so to the tsar Alexis they virtually say, 'We must needs do, in order to obtain thy alms, whatever thou askest of us; whether it be to condemn Nicon, or to absolve and bless Ligarides.'

we will begin to build the monastery of holy Bethlehem. The church at Jerusalem is the sepulchre and the place of the crucifixion and the resurrection of the great King, and the foundation of the first emperor who reigned in time past over Christians. And to whom else should it belong to give help and show care for the sepulchre of the King of kings but to the Christian tsar, that is, to thy holy empire, by the grace of God the only-begotten and the first-born, of all orthodox Christians the glory, the consolation, the light, and the refreshment? Thou art not merely in name a king or emperor, but more by thy many good acts and energies. Above the diadem thy glory is the cross; above the sceptre is this, that thou art a father to the fatherless, and a protector everywhere to the Churches of God. Look upon us, then, most serene great lord, autocrat and invincible tsar, Alexis Michaelovich! If *any* churches are to be built by men, it is right that those places should be built and repaired where the feet of Christ trod, the place which was hallowed by the blood of Christ. If any one would give assistance in that quarter where there is most need, *that* quarter are *we*, since originally it was thence that the destruction of the Christians began; and of the impious and the enemies there are many, and they indefatigable and proud and rich, but of the orthodox there are very few, and they powerless: nevertheless, with all their weakness, the orthodox Christians wherever we go give us help according to their means. It is meet and right, then, that thy holy empire also should be charitable towards the holy sepulchre, as a tsar most glorious and renowned.

Farther, we beg and entreat thee, O great hossoudar, respecting the imposts hateful to God, that thou wouldst give order that in thy blessed time they should not be taken from the poor Greeks; and receive not such assistance to thy treasury. For this, O autocratic and most glorious tsar, is nothing else than a device of the devil to strip many poor people, who find and have no very great refreshment and relief from thy powerful empire. And those trading people who come to Moscow and go about other lands all trade not with their own money; but there are at Constantinople many noble and honourable people who have fallen into poverty; and what property they have left they give it to the trading people, and they trade with it; and whatever they make from that profit they give to the holy se-

pulchre from every sorok of sables at the rate of one λευκόν. If there is any Greek who is reckless and bad, one man ought not to be an occasion for punishing all. Judas, who was one of the Apostles, sinned; but that was not made a reproach against all the Apostles. But in so great poverty the poor Greeks have to suffer the exaction of heavy payments from the infidels: only from thy powerful empire they might get some small alleviation and relief, and [in return would pray] that, as hitherto God keeps it by his intervention from all enemies, so he would continue to keep it for time to come. Only do not permit, O hossoudar, that they should mix lead with the gold, that the brightness of the gold may not be dimmed. Thus we pray thee, as thy most humble slaves, for the love of Christ.

Farther, we beg and beseech thee with much hope in behalf of the metropolitan of Adrianople hospodin Neophytus, who makes his petition to thee, O great hossoudar, for a gift of icons, of which he wrote before. Those icons he wishes to set in the new church which he has now built very handsomely, so that another such church is not to be found in all Thrace.

The letter of thy imperial majesty was brought to us by the artisan Herodion the Greek with fidelity and punctuality: and the letter of thy imperial majesty to the œcumenical patriarch was in like manner delivered to him. But the œcumenical patriarch, O hossoudar, *has nothing whatever to do with the chair of Jerusalem*, and can do nothing in relation to the bishops [subject to it]. *Only* [if he attempted it] *he might* bring upon himself *excommunication and the wrath of God for our sins.* Parthenius, late patriarch of the œcumenical chair, a man undisciplined and unlearned, who understood not the legitimate rule, was neither rightly instructed about the canons of the councils and the services, nor about the ecclesiastical orders [of the hierarchy]; and he stretched forth his hand where it was not given to him to meddle, and caused trouble and disorder to the apostolical patriarchal chairs of Alexandria and Antioch,[69] and so lifted himself up that he sought also to meddle with the most blessed ex-patriarch of Jerusalem Nectarius. For this

[69] Interfering so as to take part in the deposition of the patriarchs Paisius and Macarius from their chairs. See p. 430, 478; and p. 558. The tsar seems to have written a separate letter to the patriarch Parthenius IV. of C.P., before he was put out of the chair and Dionysius IV. restored, to induce him to use his influence also with the patriarch of Jerusalem, Nectarius, in favour of Ligarides.

cause the wrath of God came upon him, and rewarded him according to his heart, and accomplished all his counsel. And the metropolitan of Gaza can have no importunity whatever made for him from the œcumenical patriarch, because the œcumenical patriarch, according to the holy and sacred canons, *has no authority in the patriarchate of Jerusalem*, not merely to excommunicate or absolve a bishop, but not even a deacon. But *as for that which the above-named Parthenius did for the metropolitan of Gaza, he did that as a man unlearned and ignorant of letters.*

Lastly, we heartily pray the Almighty God to give thee all good things both of this life here on earth and of the life in heaven to come, and to defend thee from all enemies visible and invisible, together with thy noble and religious children, and multiply the blessed race of thy holy empire for many years. Amen.

Herewith we have sent one small icon of ancient painting from the holy sepulchre, as a blessing. And may the grace and mercy of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost, the consubstantial Deity, be with thy holy empire. Written in the year from Christ's Nativity 1669, Nov. 1, at Philippopolis.

The constant beadsman of thy holy and powerful empire Dositheus, by the mercy of God patriarch of the holy city of Jerusalem.

ii. *Translation from a Greek writing, being a letter of absolution which was sent to the great hossoudar &c. by the patriarch of Jerusalem Dositheus in favour of Paisius metropolitan of Gaza.*

Dositheus by the mercy of God patriarch of the holy city of Jerusalem and of all Palestine:

Whereas it has happened to the most reverend metropolitan of Gaza, that he as a man has sinned in certain points, and for his guilt was put out from the sacred ministration and from the clergy of the Church by the ex-patriarch Kyr *Nectarius*, and *by all the sacred synod of Jerusalem*, and now there has written to us the most religious, the most serene, and god-crowned hossoudar the tsar and grand prince Alexis Michaelovich, autocrat of all Great, Little, and White Russia, and has asked of us a pardon for the same metropolitan of Gaza, we, out of consideration for his request, and of our affection for his holy and powerful empire, hold him, the said Paisius Ligarides metropolitan of

Gaza, for absolved, and blessed of the Lord God Almighty and our Lord Jesus Christ, and freed from all excommunication and curse under which he had been placed by the sentence of the ex-patriarch Nectarius: and by the grace of God we restore him to communion and unite him to the holy Church, and allow him to be and to be entitled the legitimate bishop of the see of Gaza, and to perform all proper episcopal acts without let or prejudice. Moreover we have *recommended* [*i.e.* have sent a *recommendation*] to the holy city of Jerusalem, *to our father Nectarius and to all the synod, that they should absolve* him the same Kyr Paisius *in like manner as he* by the grace of the Holy Ghost *is absolved* [or pardoned] and set right [justified, rectified, *i.e.* as it were, acquitted] *by our humility, out of affection for the most serene and autocratic christian tsar* Alexis Michaelovich, autocrat of all Great, Little, and White Russia. This letter of absolution [or pardon] is written by our humility in Philippopolis, in the year from Christ's birth 1669, in the month of October. [And below the letter has the subscription]

Dositheus patriarch of the holy city of Jerusalem.

XXXI.

From Paisius, metropolitan of Gaza, to the great hossoudar Alexis Michaelovich &c. (*written after the tsar had received those letters of the patriarch Dositheus which have been printed above.*)

Most illustrious and most religious autocrat, &c. Some say that the *Absolution* sent from the patriarch of Jerusalem Dositheus is irregular, because I was deposed not by Dositheus but by Nectarius [now ex-patriarch of Jerusalem], and was by him suspended from celebrating. For every one, it is said, must be absolved by him by whom he was bound. But this is not always so: [and he quotes at length the cases of Athanasius, of Marcellus bishop of Ancyra, of Theodoret, of Macarius patriarch of Antioch (who was deposed by the Sixth council), of Arius, of Eutychius the archimandrite (who was deposed by St. Flavian patriarch of C.P.), of St. J. Chrysostom, of Peter bishop of Melete (who was restored by Photius), and of many others who were deposed by Ignatius, and restored by Photius]. So it is false that a man must be absolved by him that bound him. And besides, one may illustrate the same by modern instances: The

present patriarch of Alexandria, *Paisius*, was *deposed by Parthenius patriarch of C.P., and restored by the present patriarch of C.P. Methodius at the intercession of thy imperial majesty.* The metropolitan Pitirim was repeatedly condemned by the patriarch Nicon for having ridden on the ass on Palm Sunday: he even sent a libel or written accusation against him to the synod. And so, as he was not absolved by Nicon, neither was he absolved [they would say, I suppose] by the most blessed patriarchs, nor by all the synod. And so it would forsooth be necessary to petition Nicon, who had bound him, and who is still living. But this cannot well be done: and it is not fitting to ask the blessing of him who is deposed from his chair: [it is clear, then, that they are wrong].

And whereas Nectarius suspended me, it is therefore quite regular that Dositheus, the direct successor of Nectarius patriarch of Jerusalem, should absolve me, whom the patriarch Nectarius consecrated and raised to the patriarchal chair publicly with his own hands, and gave him the patriarchal staff in the church. And so the same Nectarius has after that no longer power to bind and to loose, because he of himself left his throne: else there would be at once two patriarchs of Jerusalem, and a division in the Church of God. But for him that is wise and understanding a few words will suffice. Paisius Ligarides metropolitan of Gaza makes his *petition* for a *righteous revision.*

THE END.

PRINTED BY ROBSON AND SONS, PANCRAS ROAD, N.W.

Works translated by the Rev. R. W. Blackmore, M.A.

HISTORY OF THE RUSSIAN CHURCH. By A. N. Mouravieff. London, Masters, 1842.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE RUSSIAN CHURCH; with a separate Appendix, entitled A Harmony of Anglican and Eastern Doctrine. London, Masters, 1846.

Works by W. Palmer, M.A.

DISSERTATIONS ON SUBJECTS RELATING TO THE 'ORTHODOX' OR 'EASTERN-CATHOLIC' COMMUNION. London, Masters, 1855. 10*s.* 6*d.*

EARLY CHRISTIAN SYMBOLISM. London, Burns, Masters, Hayes, 1859. 1*s.* 6*d.*

EGYPTIAN CHRONICLES. 2 vols. 8vo. London, Trübner, Masters, 1861. 10*s.* 6*d.*

THE PATRIARCH AND THE TSAR:

Vol. I. THE REPLIES OF THE PATRIARCH NICON. London, Trübner and Co., 1871. 12*s.*

Vol. II. TESTIMONIES CONCERNING THE PATRIARCH NICON, THE TSAR AND THE BOYARS, FROM THE TRAVELS OF THE PATR. MACARIUS OF ANTIOCH, as printed in 1836 for the Oriental Translation Fund, with Corrections and Appendices. London, Trübner and Co., 1872. 12*s.*

DATE DUE

BX 597 .N5 P3 1970 v.3 982
Palmer, William, 1811-1879.
The patriarch and the tsar

UNITED THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

UNITED THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY LIBRARY
3 0645 1000 7052 9